THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVII SEPTEMBER, 1938 No. 219

EDITORIAL

An anonymous pamphlet, "Liturgical Uniformity *versus* Unity of Belief" (Pilot Paper No. 3), deserves an extended notice. This is not merely because it contains two skilfully selected excerpts from our columns, passages which may be excused for shivering a little at being deprived of their warm contexts, but because it raises a vital question about the character of the Church of England. The pamphlet is the work of a man who cares deeply, even passionately, for his cause. To his sincerity, as well as to his ability, we do ungrudging honour, but we hope that the impression left on readers will be one of moral rectitude rather than of logical or historical correctness. The essay is brilliant and, if regard be had to the fact that most people read a pamphlet only once, very persuasive. But at each fresh perusal—and we have given it several—some of the verisimilitude slips away, till at last it shrinks to a narrative that is not indeed bald—the writer is still, in a literary sense, the soldier

> bearded like the pard,
> Seeking the bubble reputation
> Even in the cannon's mouth

—but unconvincing. For it attempts to prove too much. It asserts that the bishops have betrayed the Church of England, that Anglicanism means nothing except holding to credal orthodoxy as a minimum, and that it is both natural and right to enrich the Liturgy to any extent in accordance with whatever may be believed to be true.

Is it really the fact that the Anglican episcopate are trying "to introduce a new religion"? And that this is what Newman called "Liberalism, the anti-dogmatic principle, the enemy"?

In one place we hear only of an alleged desire that Liberalism should have "a legitimate standing-ground in the Church of England," but elsewhere the accusation is definite. Thus:

> Today it is seriously proposed to substitute for this (*i.e.*, orthodoxy) as the basis of Anglicanism an enforced uniformity of Liturgy, which is to cover the widest divergence of fundamental belief.
>
> We are confronted with a revolutionary change in the character of Anglicanism.
>
> Under the pretence that a new "liturgical anarchy" threatens the Church, they are going about to establish an ecclesiastical martial law by a *pronunciamento*. It is the method of all would-be dictators to foment disturbance and then proclaim that the safety of the State calls for the forcible suppression of all liberty but their own, all law but their decrees.
>
> They think of the English Church as National, and nothing more. To keep it that they would sacrifice all else: their great principle is the "Establishment."
>
> Right through the central body of Anglicanism and among the Evangelicals there is a sober and unhappy conviction that the whole basis of Anglicanism is being undermined and its orthodoxy broken up. Moderate men everywhere are beginning to feel that they will have to re-examine the whole basis of their adherence at all costs to the English Church, and to count that cost; and, if need be, to refuse to pay it.

This sinister revolution, it is said, did not begin with *Lux Mundi*. Bishop Gore, "however much he minimized the authority of the Church in some directions," would not have countenanced the Doctrinal Report. It began with *Foundations*, and it is regarded as ominous that three of the writers in that book—the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Derby, and Sir Walter Moberly—are among the twenty-four members of the Commission. It seems to be suggested that these three theologians have persuaded their fellow-members of the Commission to jettison the Creed, and that the two of them who are in episcopal orders have persuaded their fellow-bishops to care for nothing except the Establishment. We are not convinced of it.

Nor are we convinced that Anglicanism consists simply of the acceptance of the Creeds as a minimum, and upon all else is unheroically content to be ambiguous. To the question

which naturally arises—What then of progress and development?—our author has a simple answer. There is only one kind of progress. Protestantism is rigid, and has accordingly become almost extinct. "Catholic thought, on the contrary, is perpetually enriching itself from within, and coming to fresh appreciations of truth by development." The œcumenical formulæ, of course, "stand out unmoved." All else develops, and since about 1880 "all that was progressive in the religion of Anglicanism was forced henceforward to develop apart from the Anglican Church *as a Church*." Since a date earlier than that—

> In all that time we have never once received from the episcopate one single corporate gesture which by some stretch of the word could be called generous—it is a pitiful thing, not *once* in a century. We have endured what we have to endure, if not always patiently, at least loyally, for a single all-sufficient reason. The Church of England was still orthodox, still Anglican. While that remained, we must remain. That reason for patience and loyalty the bishops, or some of them, are wearing dangerously thin.

* * * * *

The thing for which encouragement was desired from the bishops is thus described:

> The primary result of the Oxford Movement has been to enrich and supplement (never to impair) the credal minimum of orthodoxy from the sources which produced the creeds—the organic tradition of Christendom.

Because of this, "Anglican worship has come to be increasingly enriched and supplemented from the self-same sources." Thus, it is natural to enrich the Liturgy from any source that can be called Catholic. If you believe, for example, in the doctrinal conclusions of the Council of Trent, or in the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, or in the infallibility of the Pope, your liturgy may be enriched accordingly. And nobody should mind if "we" do this, because it is Catholic addition and not Liberal subtraction, and because Anglicanism has always "left men free on those things." Anglicanism, rightly understood, has no objection, it would seem, to the use of the Liturgy in Latin, or to the safeguarding of an enriched Eucharistic doctrine by adding anything that may be desired from the Mass of any other Church.

* * * * *

And yet it is admitted that we have a Liturgy. It is described as "very English," and even the Articles are given a pat on the back and set beside the Prayer Book. But those documents were, in the main, "only fragments not self-explanatory in isolation." What was their setting? "The general orthodox tradition of Christendom in faith and worship." True, but was it not at the same time the Reformation? We have always supposed that the Prayer Book, and rather less stoutly the Articles, desired to continue the orthodox Catholic tradition. We have known persons who think that they ought not at the same time to have compromised or conceded anything to Reform. But we have not hitherto encountered anyone who imagines that they did not, or that if they did it was only a gesture, not meant to be taken seriously. Our writer suggests that hymnody is a useful illustration of the advantages of liberty. He says that Bishop Blomfield once objected to "Jesu, Lover of my soul" on the ground that it was "alien" to the spirit of Anglicanism. He might as well have said that Mr. Gladstone once objected to it on the ground that each line contains a different metaphor. For hymns are matter of choice. It is quite possible that if we had had an official hymn-book it would have been a bad one. But does our author want to be as free to choose liturgies as he is to choose hymns?

We applaud, we even share, our author's concern for the maintenance of the Catholic Faith. But is there no science of theology? Is there no search for truth? Is it not a duty at all times to attempt to relate the Faith to new knowledge? There is no sign in the pamphlet of any love of the truth, except in so far as it is contained in the inherited Faith. We ourselves are sure that it is so contained, but we are unable to forget that there were ages in Christian history when Platonism and Aristotelianism were used with good effect, and indeed that there has been almost no age in which something has not been used with some not altogether bad effect, in the work of interpreting Christianity in the language of that age. Our writer fastens upon the Note on Symbolism in the Doctrinal Report. He calls it "egregious." It is indeed the most delicate, the most controversial point of the Report, which was felt by some members of the Report to concede too large a liberty. But has our author understood the meaning attached to the word "symbolism"? He says wittily, but not in good taste, that "'Conceived by the Holy Ghost' is not *symbolic*

of ' conceived by St. Joseph.' Would those gentlemen take it as a legitimate explication of the ' symbolic language ' of the Liturgy to say that our bishops ' receive St. Joseph for the office and work of a bishop,' or that ' St. Joseph ' might decently be substituted for ' Thy Holy Spirit ' in the proposed epiclesis of 1928 ?"

This does less than justice to the Modernists. We have always felt an imperfect sympathy with their ways of attempting to commend the religious value of their restatements of the language of the Creeds, and we have wondered whether all that religious value was legitimately obtained. But the thing which they take to be symbolized is the doctrine of the Incarnation. What the Doctrinal Report said was:

> There are some among us (as contrasted with " many ") who hold that a full belief in the historical Incarnation is more consistent with the supposition that our Lord's birth took place under the normal conditions of human generation. In their minds the notion of a Virgin Birth tends to mar the completeness of the belief that in the Incarnation God reveals Himself at every point in and through human nature.

This represents an attempt to believe the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is, in our judgment, an unsatisfying attempt. But it is an attempt to do *quod facit ecclesia.* It is an attempt to reach the true end. We all must find symbolism in the language of the Creed. No one supposes that facts simply as facts can have saving value. The Modernists make symbolism go all the way and do more than it can do. But their faces seem to be turned in a good direction.

* * * * *

These notes, which have been written in the intervals of explaining to an international *Seminar* at Geneva what the Church of England is really like, are already long. Some further comment of a liturgical kind must be postponed.

"DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND"

A speech made in the Lower House of York Convocation by the Dean of York, when proposing—

"That this House welcomes the report of the Commission on Doctrine, published under the title *Doctrine in the Church of England*, as a survey of the currents of thought and belief within the Church, a statement of the agreement and disagreement actually existing, and a contribution to the understanding and appreciation of one another on the part of those who differ; it recognizes that the report neither is nor claims to be a declaration of the doctrine of the Church—a purpose lying outside the Commission's terms of reference and one for which no Commission appointed as this was could be competent; it desires that the report may be widely studied in that spirit of open-minded devotion to truth and readiness to learn from every tradition of Christian thought which is characteristic of the report itself.

"Further, inasmuch as many have misunderstood the function of this Commission as explained above, this House, while recognizing the reality of the problems which scholars and theologians are handling, and desiring to maintain in the Church the fullest freedom of enquiry which is compatible with spiritual fellowship, thinks well to state that the doctrine of the Church of England is now, as it has been in past time, the doctrine set forth in the Creeds, in the Prayer Book and in the Articles of Religion."

I regard both parts of the resolution as of almost equal importance; the second part is certainly at least as vital as the first, and it is the general motion contained in those two paragraphs that I desire to commend to the sense of the House.

I think it wise that in speaking to the resolution I should use general terms. It is probable that members of the House will desire to enter into detailed criticism of this or that clause in the resolution, but my purpose in accepting the task of proposing it is rather to present a general picture.

At one point, at any rate, I imagine that the whole House will be in agreement; they will commend the wisdom of the steps which led to the appointment of the Doctrinal Commission. Those steps are summarized in the letter from Archbishop Davidson which is printed at the beginning of the report. The Archbishops had been conscious, as we all are, that the Church

of England was, I will not say unique in Christendom, but at least notable among Churches, in virtue of its desire to include within itself, on terms of freedom, a markedly rich variety of religious experience and outlook. I ask you to reflect for a moment upon the blessings which arise from this quality of our Church life, and the risks to which it exposes us.

I believe myself without hesitation that we are all the better, and all the more characteristically a Church, because mentally and even spiritually we include Parthians, Medes, Elamites, Mesopotamians and other types of Christian, who are yet able to cohere in the life of one body. It would be much simpler, of course, if all variations were ironed out; life would be much easier for all of us if we took mechanical ways to ensure this; dictatorships and infallibilism in Church and State do undoubtedly produce the speediest and most obvious results, and afford the surest method of herding a passive multitude along a definite road. A series of stiffly worded signposts and directions which no one can mistake, and which always deals in categorical imperatives, is the simplest device for guiding the herd along its road.

But that is not our conception of the Church, nor is it consonant with the spirit of our tradition. We have grown up for centuries in another atmosphere altogether, accepting freedom, reverently and humbly prepared to face its risks, and, together with freedom, accepting the certainty of large variations. Yet it seems only too clear—and it was clear to the Archbishops all those years ago—that if the several "isms" and tendencies which belong to the various types of mind are left simply to go their own way in separation, then they tend to specialize in their own products, and in the end to impoverish themselves, all the time impoverishing those with whom they are not sharing their intellectual and spiritual life.

It is important to bear these generalities in mind—I hope they do not tax the patience of the House too heavily. Most of us have been for a very long while familiar, through the teaching of Baron von Hügel, with his threefold division of the chief religious interests as institutional, rational and mystical. And do not those three elements in religion correspond roughly to three types of mind? There are those who find it easiest to make their approach to God through what is outward and ordered, through corporate discipline; there are those to whom the things inward and unseen, which can hardly be squeezed into the framework of outward order, are precious beyond all else; and there are those—and their existence is not easy for everyone to recognize—to whom the call to love the Lord their God with their mind is, above all things, sacred.

I wonder whether you remember the story of Hegel, the philosopher, who was once scolded by his housekeeper because, when she went off to church on a Sunday, he appeared to sit still in his study and do nothing? The words which Hegel used in reply were these, "*Das Denken ist auch Gottesdienst*" —*i.e.*, "Thinking is one way of worship"; the answer was a true one, and it may remind us that there are those whose approach to God is predominantly made through the activities of the judging, the analytic and synthetic mind.

Yet, if the institutionalist, the mystic and the thinker go their own way in isolation, then the currents of life tend to be canalized, and, whereas the mystic needs to learn from the man of institutions how those institutions can provide him with just the framework, the stability, which he needs, and whereas neither the spirit of reason nor the spirit of order are sufficient by themselves for fulness of life, there is always the possibility that these spirits or types will keep apart, dwelling too much on themselves and too little on each other.

This possibility was surely in the minds of the Archbishops when they asked the representatives of the main types of opinion in the Church to get together and to consider the fabric of Christian doctrine, with the motives indicated in the report. I am sure the Archbishops have felt that the Catholic-minded man, for instance, needs a strong dose of Evangelical friendships, interests and co-operations if he is not to harden off into a modern type of Pharisee, and that the Liberal, if he is left to himself, is tempted to become painfully self-conscious and assertive, especially along the road of negation. Having these things in mind, the Archbishops have asked the representatives of various interests and groups to come together and seek for mutual understanding, lest they should hive off, and allow the thinking and religious experience of the Church to go on for ever in separate water-tight compartments. Such was the motive underlying the appointment of the Doctrinal Commission; the separate elements which, we rejoice to think, are combined in the life of the one body, were to be encouraged to a rich interchange one with another.

The task, therefore, that was set before the Commission was such as is summarized in the words occurring in the motion before the House. It was instructed to make "a survey of the currents of thought and belief"—not of the results of thinking; it was to try to state "the agreement and disagreement actually existing"; and to attempt to contribute to the "understanding and appreciation of one another on the part of those who differ." Each of these three tasks which were laid before the Commission was in itself important, but I believe it was the third task that

was likely to be most valuable—the attempt to see how, when men who were thinking honestly got together, there would be thesis on one side and antithesis on the other, but then, if in the light of the love of the truth and of Him who is the truth, both did their utmost to put thesis and antithesis together, they would experience at least the dawning of a hope that they might be led on together towards a truth which transcended the partial half-truths which either side had previously held in separation. Those who have read the report with any degree of sympathy will be conscious that such a drawing together is genuinely manifested on page after page.

I have looked backward so far, because I think it is desirable that we should first of all welcome the fact that the Doctrinal Commission was appointed at all. But the motion which I am proposing is not concerned with the initiation of the Commission; it is concerned with its issue—that is, with the report which has now been published. In this motion the House is asked to do what some of its members may feel rather reluctant to do—it is asked to welcome the report. But I would remind the House that the welcome we are asked to extend to the report is qualified by what follows; we are asked to welcome the report for what it is—namely, as supplying a survey of the currents of thought, a statement of agreement and disagreement, and a contribution to understanding. We are not asked either to welcome or to express our dissatisfaction in respect of what the report does not at all profess to be. We are not to regard it as a doctrinal formulation. That is definitely cut out. We recognize—my resolution says this clearly—that the report "neither is nor claims to be a declaration of the doctrine of the Church—a purpose lying outside the Commission's terms of reference." It is not to be regarded in this light at all. Hard though this may be for some of us, we are asked to think of it as being what it is—namely, a cross-section or composite picture of the present adventure of thought within the Church of England. That adventure is a process of thinking and discussion, which, like the group on this platform which was photographed this morning, has been arrested a moment for the purpose of record, in order that we may be able to see, as I think I myself do see, both how very large is the area of problems on which the most various types of mind find themselves fundamentally at one, and also just where the points of tenderness and difficulty are encountered; what are the chief "tensions," to use one of von Hügel's favourite words, between the main types of thought, and, having seen this, to look forward and begin to think along what lines we may hope to see those tensions resolved as the movement "into all truth" goes forward.

I hope it is not unkind to say that it will be easier for members of this House to welcome the report with which they are dealing, if it happens that they have taken the pains to read it through. I do not say that flippantly, but simply because I have friends who have picked up the report, tossed over its pages, and found that they are not drawn really to move forward with the slow-stepping pace which the argument in those pages has taken. If we do try to see the labour which the report incorporates, in such a way as to work together with the Commission through even a part of the vast range of questions that are there covered, it will be easier for us, having taken that amount of pains, to say that we are glad to have the report, and are ready to study it further in the spirit which my resolution recommends, the spirit of open-minded devotion to truth.

I know that it is tempting to take the apparently easier course, but I question whether that is compatible with even-handed justice. It is easier to pick out the questions with which one's own mind seems to be most crucially concerned, to fasten upon the divergences which may be disclosed in that context as though those divergences were the sum and substance of the real body of the report, and then, in natural alarm, to proclaim that the Ark of God is in danger. I recognize the naturalness and easiness of that course; but most of us will feel, I think, that it is hardly the wisest or most equitable line to take. If we give to the report the hours of study which it requires, reading it with care, we shall realize that the cost of this co-operative work of thinking—cost, not merely in mental endeavour but also in the deliberate effort of charity—has been very high, and that the result of this expenditure is seen (it is at any rate visible to my own mind) on page after page, as the argument, perhaps rather laboriously at times, strains its way along; the result is to be seen, by the patient reader, in massive affirmations which establish and safeguard priceless elements of truth, so that I would myself hesitate to judge the report casually or, so to say, piecemeal. Although I recognize the extreme difficulty of reviewing so large a document with what might be called a synoptic eye, I should hesitate in picking out from it the things which interest me most. I wish, if I can, to look at it as a whole; this I have tried to do, and as the result of that experience the general impression upon my mind is that of the mass and momentum of the great truths which, after thesis and antithesis, are there re-stated. It is the positive content for religion which in the end impresses me most and enables me, with such seriousness as so weighty a book requires, to welcome the thing that has been achieved.

Members of the House will be aware that I am speaking all the time in very general terms, and I propose to continue doing so. I admit that it is congenial to me to dwell on broad principles of liberty, because that fits in best with my own outlook, as one who for many years has tried to be a liberal Catholic; and yet I ought not, even in speaking very generally, to evade or ignore the kind of consideration which was mentioned yesterday in the House, and which was expressed in the Petition with which the House has already dealt. I ought to recognize that what the petitioners have felt and expressed is a real and legitimate anxiety, that the disturbance of mind to which they refer is a genuine, and, within its limits, a rightful pain. Such is the condition of the faith as it is entrusted to us, such is our task in regard to it, that always, on that fringe at which "all things go off into mystery," at the point where we encounter the profoundest difficulties of the inter-relation between the visible and the invisible, and at which searching questions confront us, deep and painful problems present themselves about which a man certainly has to make up his mind.

But a man—and certainly one so constituted as I myself am—has for ever to be re-making his mind, for ever trying to say how these difficult and delicate questions present themselves in the changing light of the appreciation of truth as modern experience colours it. Browning once wrote, "How very hard it is to be a Christian, hard for you and me." I find that this has truth in it; that I am for ever attempting to re-grasp, to re-hold and re-affirm with all the honesty which I can command, my grasp of the fundamental truths of the catholic faith, in face of, and, as far as possible, in consonance with, the changing and advancing line of thought and knowledge as they go forward.

And such is the position of our faith, within this world of men, that while the belief of the charcoal-burner, the simple and unquestioning adhesion of the millions, is, as much as the blood of the martyrs, the very seed of the Church, and while the Christian fellowship does live, perhaps to an extent that historians have rarely appreciated, upon the massive faith and assent of the millions, yet it is not only by or in the unquestioning millions that the faith lives on. It may be that those who are called to undertake the hazardous task of historical, literary and philosophical criticism are few in number, but still perhaps in their measure they are not less precious in the sight of God than those whom the stimulus of thought and enquiry never reaches. I feel that we ought to claim justice for that type as well as for the other, that we ought at any rate to recognize the delicacy and the difficulty which beset the path of those who, while they worship in humble faith together with

the body of their brethren, are yet, for some part of their activity, compelled to live entirely in the dry light of science and of scientific enquiry, where it is not their duty to think, "Whither will this argument lead me?" but to say, "I am compelled to pursue the truth and to follow this argument whithersoever it may lead me, and pray God it may lead me to the haven where I would be." If there is to be justice, a due place must be allowed to that part, though it may be thought a very limited one, of the task of the Church.

I would re-enforce this consideration in another way. I ask you to think whether there is not a lesson to be learned, in the context of the resolution before us, from the past century of history. Never, in the story of man upon this planet, never have there been such enormous, such far-reaching revolutions of thought as have crowded into the experience of mankind in these hundred years. The nineteenth century, and that part of the twentieth century through which we have stumbled so far, are without parallel in the history of mankind. I ask you to reflect in quietude on the way in which modern science has burst out into enormous specializations, which have taken its enquiry incredibly far into the infinitely vast, and as incredibly far into the infinitely little. I ask you to present to your minds the picture of pre-Victorian geology or biology or physics, and then to think what it has meant to the mind of man in relation to the things which he sees around him that the really scientific study of phenomena has been created, and has reached maturity, in a few decades; then, realizing how enormous the impact of physical enquiry upon men's minds has been, I ask you to remember also those movements of learning which have had a more direct influence upon the specific problems of our religion; the birth of critical study—for it was more than a re-birth—of literary, historical and philosophical enquiry, as applied to the Old Testament and to the New Testament. I ask you to think of the revolution which the Church has been called upon to live through in these respects, and to reflect how often, in the nineteenth century as in the twentieth, it has seemed to be the easiest way, the best way for the Church, the safest way for the Gospel, just for the sake of the simple souls who find this world and its problems tormenting to their faith, to preclude discussion, to invoke discipline, to set up fences, to extirpate this and that modernism by edict. How often has it been tempting to take that line, and in the experience of the Church has such a policy ever for a moment been fruitful of good?

Some of us, of course, are old enough to recall episodes in that story. When I was a youngish man, Robertson Smith,

the great Old Testament scholar, finding the orthodoxy of his native land too narrow for him, was living in exile, so to speak, in a Cambridge college. When I was an undergraduate, I remember trying in vain to get into St. Mary's Church at Oxford on the day when Dr. Liddon announced his complete and final severance from the novel teaching (so it then seemed) that was being proclaimed by Charles Gore. The air was full of excommunications; as in the days of Colenso and F. D. Maurice, the timorous were insistent for decisive action. But I would remind the House, that in this critical century our Church has rendered an almost unique service to Christendom, and certainly, in God's providence, has gained enormously in robustness and strength, by its obvious fearlessness at such moments of crisis. Perhaps there is something in the English character which is responsive to that old Homeric word of courage, ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλλεσσον—"Kill me if you must, but kill me in the light." Perhaps we are so made that the call to strive for the truth unto the death is one which we are not sorry to hear; if so, it will be unchivalrous, at this moment, to forget the way in which we have been led, and the way along which, in God's mercy, we have again and again found deliverance.

It is this, more than anything else, that was in my mind when I ventured to accept the task of proposing this resolution. It is in this spirit that I myself can welcome the report of the Commission with all that is disquieting in it. Even a pagan can say, in the moment of danger, "*O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.*" The Christian has a surer word of faith on his lips, "*Dominus illuminatio mea*": "the Lord is my light and my salvation: of whom then shall I be afraid?"

It is in this spirit that I welcome the report for what it is, for what it has done, and for those whose minds are represented in it. I hope that our minds will be led forward, further and further, towards the resolution of the discords within it which still remain to be resolved. I propose the resolution in both its paragraphs because, when I reflect on our special vocation, I do desire to promote that for which, within our Church, I am perhaps more grateful than for anything else—namely, its maintenance of "the fullest freedom of enquiry which is compatible with spiritual fellowship." I propose it also humbly and reverently, resting firmly upon the affirmation with which it concludes, that the teaching of the Church of England is, as it has been in past time, the doctrine set forth in the Creeds of the Catholic Church of Christ.

H. N. Bate.

THANKS DUE TO THE REVISED VERSION

A. A Poor Man's One-Roomed House in Galilee

The "house," a thing of four walls, was built of clay. A raised platform divided the one room into two parts: a curtain sometimes preserved the privacy of the inner half. Fadl'-ullah slept on the lower level, his mother on the higher level within. Of "furniture" in the European sense none was to be seen, but there were two or three little lamps of earthenware; two of them could be bought for a farthing. Two other objects caught the eye: one was the lampstand for raising the poor little lamp so that it could give a glimmering light to the women's compartment as well as to the men's. And there was, of course, the *modius*, the "bushel," which contained the flour for the household. There were no bedclothes: Fadl'-ullah slept like other poor men in his workday clothes (Deut. xxiv. 12, 13). Darkness was coming on, and Fadl'-ullah found a lamp and lighted it. The lamp showed up the bushel, a big object in the little room, but he took no notice of it; he turned to the lampstand, and placed his lamp upon it, that it might throw its puny light the further into the night. (Fadl'-ullah was my host in 1895.)

Such a bit of village life was a familiar sight to our Lord, and He made a "parable" of it, a picture-incident drawn with the fewest possible lines:

"Neither do men light a *lamp* and put it under *the* bushel, but on *the* stand; and it *shineth* unto all that are in the house" (Matt. v. 15, R.V.).

The Greek and the R.V. give "a lamp," just one of those cheap pieces of earthenware that are dug up almost in hundreds in Palestine. The rendering "candle" in the A.V. means one detail of the picture lost; in fact "candles" are never mentioned in the New Testament—the Greek word is always (about a dozen times) *luchnos*, "lamp." A further detail is lost from the picture unless with the Greek and the R.V. we twice read the definite article—"*the* bushel, *the* stand." The house is a poor man's home with one lampstand only, and only one large measure—the *modius*. And finally when the Revisers, following carefully the Greek, write of the little lamp that it "*shineth* unto all that are in the house," they avoid the exaggerated language of the A.V., "*it giveth light* unto all that are in the house." It was a speck of light, a glimmer for men to see; it was not a supply of light for men to work by.

The disciples were Galileans and poor, and their lamp could

not shine far into this naughty world, but the Lord teaches them to put it on the stand—*i.e.*, on the vantage-ground which the Lord Himself had provided, and to let it shine its best.

Some critics would describe the work of the Revisers in the three instances I have quoted as "pedantry"; I would rather call it insight into the life of the poor in Palestine.

Another instance of our Lord's realization of the poverty of His followers is found in Mark vi. 8. He instructs the Twelve, when he sends them out, to take "no money" in their purse. A marginal note (R.V.) tells us that the Greek for *money* is *brass*, the poor man's money. With this the A.V. agrees, but it adds (unfortunately) that *brass* is here taken for *money in general*.

B. The Will (Greek *θέλημα*) of God.

Those who study the New Testament know how useful is a Concordance. Many passages are linked together in meaning by some significant word, and when they are studied in common they throw light on one another. But a Concordance to the Authorized Version, though it is generally useful, fails us in many instances. Many readers will think of 1 Cor. xiii. Here the rendering "charity" for the Greek *agapē* conceals the affinity of this passage with certain verses of 1 John, specially with iv. 16, "God is *love*" (*agapē*) and with iii. 16, "Hereby know we *love*, because he laid down his life for us."

Many other instances may be cited from the New Testament, but perhaps none is more worthy of remembrance than that of the Greek *thelēma*, translated "will" in the third petition of the Lord's Prayer. It occurs in other striking passages, and from them we may learn how we ought to think of God's will. Our thoughts do indeed need enlarging. We sing hymns of tender melancholy in which we profess to submit ourselves to any affliction which God's will may send upon us; but surely submissive melancholy should not be our last and only word. Did not a great hymn-writer break out into a song of praise,

"I worship thee, sweet will of God"?

This surely gives the true Biblical sound.

(*a*) The lofty petition, "Thy will be done," is the first of several passages which bring before the reader the working of the will of God in history and in pre-history. The other passages (quoted from the R.V.) are as follows:

(*b*) Matt. xviii. 14, "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." The

margin of the R.V. adds a literal translation from the Greek, " It is not a thing willed before your Father . . ." This form, strange to us, distinguishes God's fixed will from the changing wills of men.

(*c*) Matt. xxvi. 42. Our Lord in Gethsemane makes use of His own petition, " O my Father, . . . thy will be done."

(*d*) Rom. i. 10, " Making request if . . . at length I may be prospered by (margin " in ") the will of God to come unto you."

(*e*) 1 Cor. xvi. 12, " It was not at all [God's] will that he (Apollos) should come now "—*i.e.*, to Corinth (R.V. margin). Here the A.V. is at fault because it does not recognize the emphasis which the absence of the article gives to the substantive *thelēma*. The literal rendering of the Greek is, " But there was no will that he should come now "; in the Vulgate (ed. Wordsworth-White), *non fuit voluntas*. *Thelēma* standing without qualification in the New Testament means " the will of God." Emphasis on the divine will may, however, be given in a different way, as in the next passage to be quoted.

(*f*) 1 Pet. iii. 17, " For it is better if the *will* of God *should so will*, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing " (R.V.). The A.V., " If the will of God be so," is smoother, but it loses something of the force of the Greek.

(*g*) Rev. iv. 11*b*, " For thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created." Here the A.V. misses several important points, but its chief fault perhaps is that it omits the link, the great word *thelēma*, " will," which unites Rev. iv. 11*b* with the five significant passages quoted above. Our Lord taught us to pray that the will of Him who said, " Let there be light; and there was light," should be accomplished on earth and among men. But the A.V. misses the connection by using the weaker word *pleasure:* all things were created (it says) for God's pleasure: but why, oh ! why should the A.V. shun the great word of the Greek, *thelēma*, will ?

Consideration of these seven passages shows that the R.V. has repaired in four instances the loss left by the A.V. The emphasis which the Lord Himself and His Apostles lay on the working of the divine will in the life of man is brought out in the margin of the R.V. to Matt. xviii. 14, and to 1 Cor. xvi. 12, and again to 1 Pet. iii. 17. In Rev. iv. 11 the word consecrated by its use in the Lord's Prayer (thy *will*) is restored to the New Testament by the Revisers of 1881.

There are other points in Rev. iv. 11 in which the R.V. is more faithful to the original than the A.V. In particular it follows a better Greek text, and so by a change of tense recaptures the main thought of the writer: " Because of thy

will they (*i.e.*, all things) *were*, and *were created*." First, things *were*—*i.e.*, they existed in the mind of God; and afterwards they *were created*—*i.e.*, they were brought within the limitations of time and space and into touch with man; in both instances because of the will of God.

Again in the first half of this verse a change for the better—but of a different kind—is made by the Revisers. The passage now runs, " Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive *the* glory and *the* honour and *the* power." The definite article is added in the original and in the R.V. Why? Because *the* glory, the true glory, belongs to our God alone: even as it is said in Isa. xlii. 8, " I am the LORD . . . and my glory will I not give to another." John in the heathen city of Ephesus witnessed the sight of a spurious glory being daily given to " graven images " and to a heathen emperor, to Domitian most likely; but the true glory is due to our Lord and our God only. Indeed into the A.V. of Rev. iv. 11 half-a-dozen apparently small changes have been introduced by the Revisers, and a careless reader will bring a charge of pedantry against them, just because at first sight the changes seem small. The changes, however, taken as a whole bring us much nearer to the original, and the restoration in the R.V. of a definite reference to the mighty will of God is no slight gain.

The translators of 1611 prided themselves on using variety in translating the same Greek word. This liberty may no doubt have been exercised at times without injury to the sense, but there are too many instances beside that of *thelēma* in which harm has been done. One such is found in Rev. iv. 4, " And round about the throne (*i.e.*, of the Lord God Almighty) were four and twenty *thrones*; and upon the *thrones* I saw four and twenty elders sitting, arrayed in white garments; and on their heads crowns of gold." The passage reminds us of the promise of our Lord to His Apostles in Matt. xix. 28 (A.V.=R.V.), " When the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." So there are *thrones* for men even in the presence of the King. Why then should the A.V. change the Greek word into the weaker English word " seats "? The four and twenty elders have " crowns " as well as " thrones " in the original (ver. 10). Once more faithfulness to the Greek is found with the R.V., while King James' translators make a false distinction in their English. Let Bible-lovers use the light which the R.V. supplies!

W. EMERY BARNES.

WHAT IS MAN?

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS AS TO THE NATURE AND THE WORK OF MAN

Jesus saith: "Verily the Kingdom of Heaven is within you, and whoever knoweth himself shall find it."—*Oxyrhynchus Papyri.*

PROBABLY the most powerful understatement in general use is the old definition of man as "the tool-using animal." It is true that this, especially if we include in it his habit of clothing or adorning his person, does mark the line of cleavage between man and the animal world in general. The hall-mark of man is this desire for mastery over his environment, both material and social. We are no longer allowed to believe in a Special Creation of man, yet most biologists agree that evolution has occurred by sudden jumps, "mutations" which proved successful;* and the late appearance of man through such a "mutation" is, at least, reconcilable with a Providential impetus and direction of evolution.†

In *The Natural and the Supernatural* Dr. Oman traces at some length the origin of man's progress from his admittedly crude beginning to the moral, intellectual, and social attainments of modern civilization. He finds it in "the sense of the sacred," which he shows to have been "the source of the mastery over environment which has enabled man to have free ideas," and to "escape from mere immediate impression and natural desire." Dr. Oman continues, "The moment he said, 'This is sacred,' . . . he had said to his world as well as to himself, 'Thou shalt not.' Forthwith he began to be master of himself, and thereby master in his world. Then, in some true sense of the word, he began to be free."

Is there anything in the animal world which corresponds to this quality in man? Is there anything which a tiger, a sparrow, even an earwig, considers more important than life itself? Most surely there is! The helpless dependent young have a value which will fill the most timid creature with desperate protective resolve. Here is, surely, the foundation of Value. Mr. Kidd sets out to prove that this Value is not only a necessary factor in preserving the race, but the essential element of development and progress,‡ and the more the present generation sacrifices its interest for those of the next, the more sure and rapid is the advance. It is not

* Hentschel and Cook, *Biology for Medical Students* (1937).
† Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God.*
‡ B. Kidd, *The Principles of Western Civilization.*

surprising, therefore, to find this Value most markedly powerful in man.

The modern astronomer suspects that, in all this vast Universe, this earth is unique in the conditions it provides for life, and that life is therefore a mere by-product or accident.* Yet, since man is clearly the crown of a long process of development, possibly from inanimate matter, it is reasonable to infer that all the mighty forces of the Universe may have been required to evolve at last that little child, whose spirit is face to face with God; and that the mother-awe which sees in the tiny being, and worships, all the meaning of the Universe, the culmination of all that has ever been, is a true insight rather than a blind instinct. It is then not surprising to find that this strange worship of something helpless and dependent, which is yet the prime mover of all evolution and progress, this paradox at the very outset of life, finds its final expression as the Revelation of God in the Babe of Bethlehem.† By the very laws of his being man could worship no other manner of God; the Babe, which has called him from his "primeval slime," is Value Incarnate.

Yet it is equally true that what so affected him was less the Object of his solicitude than that, within himself, upon which the Object so profoundly worked—his parenthood. In the very constitution of nature is this wonderful urge of self-sacrificing devotion, of consecrated energy, centred on this helpless hope of the future. Could the searching thought of man find a better answer to the riddle of his being than that he was made in the image of a Heavenly Father, Whose Spirit dwelt in him, and, indeed, pervaded and upheld all creation? In the beginning is this three-fold God, Father and Babe, and the tension between them which is the Holy Spirit.

One of the strangest discoveries of modern science is that of the electric basis of "matter."‡ All things are dissolvable into vortices of energy, all "matter," as we know it, is simply the result of the tremendous attraction between the "positive" and "negative" charges of electricity. Nature is found to be built up by this attraction or coherence, a "principle of concretion," not yet fully understood. To the Christian it suggests, more strongly than any previous knowledge of Nature could do, that the "principle of concretion" of all Creation is indeed the same Power as that which moves in man as Love. The very bricks of which Creation is made bear witness to the truth that God is Love; that all things *are* by that Word

* J. Jeans, *This Mysterious Universe.*
† C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man.*
‡ J. B. S. Haldane, *Science and the Supernatural.*

Incarnate. That God should be Love, a love felt as personal, is the core of Reality as Unity, binding all together from the lowest strata of " in animate matter " to the highest development of conscious life,* the perfect Man who was the Witness to a Love which is intimately personal as well as cosmic. There is no being possible without some measure of it, but its binding action on the human personality is such that it has the power to co-ordinate all the resources of the individual, however loosely they were previously organized. Especially is this noticeable in action. In doing, under the strong influence of love, we become fused into an effective unity, that is both sharply aware of itself as one, and as clearly sure of the " otherness " of the other. To make these two into one is the whole purpose of love—to be one because acting as one. Yet it is the experience of life that this purpose is never achieved completely or for long, so that love is a continual witness that this life is only the partial manifestation of Reality.

There is an attraction in which the superior seeks to absorb the inferior in order to increase the self. This is not love, but desire or appetite. Jesus tells us that we must feed on Him, the lower on the Higher. There can be no resolving of this paradox except by recognition of the relationship between man and God. The earliest food known to the child is parental substance and given in love. Since all created things are formed of the " principle of concretion " even our " daily bread " is from the Being of God, but that which feeds on the Word is the Spirit which is the tension between Father and Son.

Yet there is a sense in which appetite is altogether evil: where there is no recognition of the Divine in the other, but only a self-love which seeks to increase the self. To love oneself must inevitably divide the personality into two,† the lover and the loved, making of the great co-ordinating principle a disintegrating force. In many cases, where there is no escape from self in any direction, a complete breakdown of the personality results. " He that will save his life shall lose it." On the other hand, since the greater the love, the greater the power to fuse a man into a true unity, " He that will lose his life, for My sake, shall find it."

But in order to love one must be able to recognize some Value which calls love into being. We have seen how the Spirit of the Father finds value in the Babe; in man also, the Son, there arises a sense of Value in the Father—first, in that which satisfies his material needs, but, at a very early stage, also in the selfless devotion he exhibits. There is in man a witness to

* St. Thomas Aquinas, quoted in Prestige, *God and Patristic Thought.*
† W. Temple, *Nature, Man and God.*

a Value beyond material things in what we call hero-worship, and it is therefore inevitable that this, only perfect, appeal to Divine Sonship in man should be chosen by the Divine Father.

Alone in Nature man has scaled a height inaccessible to beasts and birds whose values are confined to the visible world. Has man, then, a faculty by which he perceives that which is invisible to all other creatures? It has been definitely claimed that man has seen visions and heard voices from another level of life, the "psychic" plane, but, since there is some reason to believe that certain animals share this faculty, it is not here that we shall find this Value, although possibly the "psyche" is the ordained medium for this new element in Nature. It is contact with the Divine.

Herr Otto* points out that this contact is marked by a sense of the "holy," at first scarcely differentiated from fear of psychic manifestations but gradually growing into what we now mean by the word: a glory round the sacred, but also something that has authority in its own right over the heart and mind of man.† Thus man is armed with a dual Value, the "sacred" and the "holy," both self-authenticating,‡ which unite around the idea of God, with the authority of what is a deeply instinctive responding to a real environment; one a world of personal relationships, the other a realm of ideals.

Of the two, perhaps it is true to say, Jesus appealed most often to the "sacred," to man's sense of right and natural obligation. Every unperverted instinct was a true pointer—"What man of you . . . if his son ask a fish . . ." In following up the known good we are on the road of true development. It has its counterpart in the plant that grows steadily upwards towards the light. To recognize and respond, with simple sincerity of heart and mind, to the Good, was the one quality which Jesus demanded as indispensable.§

The findings of modern psychology‖ suggest that we have no absolutely fixed boundaries to the personality, sometimes not even one definite central self, but that we are part of a continuous flux of psychic matter; and that what is known as our "personality" consists of one or more "vortices" of "psyche," each with the power of attracting other elements from its psychic environment, chiefly by means of concentrating attention on what appears to it to be good or congenial; therefore by what we bring, in the way of attention, what we receive and become is determined. "Take heed how ye hear,"

* Otto, *The Idea of the Holy.*
† Oman, *The Natural and the Supernatural.*
‡ C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man.*
§ J. Seeley, *Ecce Homo.*
‖ J. A. Hadfield, *Immortality.*

" Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also," " To him that hath shall more be given."

It does seem as if,* by analogy with matter, the psychic material might be expected to follow a similar process of concretion, and evolve into organisms of various levels and degrees of complexity, possibly with the power of self-determination, apart from human bodies. At least one great modern psychologist trends towards this view. After making all allowances for the current ideas of the time it seems clear that Jesus believed that conscious entities, " devils," could invade a human personality.† It is noticeable that He sharply distinguishes between the " possessed " and those He calls " children of the evil one." Judas, He even calls " a devil." If the whole self is organized round self as the beloved, it is an evil vortex in the psychic world and truly called a devil. But, since it is love which integrates the self and to love oneself is to divide into two, there is in this situation a falsity which cannot possibly continue, but is the very principle of disintegration and death. Have we, in this, a light on the problem of man's freedom to defy God, and to choose to be irreconcilable, against God's Will to integrate the whole into One ? If, in " the Kingdom divided against itself," there is such an inevitable doom of disintegration, the component psychic parts are set free to be reintegrated round other centres, which, having the true principle of concretion in themselves, continually grow: " Be thou ruler over ten cities." The personality, the will of man, is utterly intangible. It is not bound to the body, it is not one and indivisible. It is, in itself, a cosmos which can be " ground to powder " if it meets in resistance that which should be its loadstone. For, in spite of itself, the elements which compose it are irresistibly drawn to Reality, and its doom is to be left at last a centre without periphery, and to be found to be nothing.

No wonder, then, that Jesus sought to find and to arouse Faith—the power to see and respond to Good, and to educate Faith so that it should know " real " good as distinct from " apparent " good.‡ So He insisted on an inner sincerity about the self which precluded self-love, and on casting out those vortices of selfish desires—on being born again and starting afresh to rebuild the self round a new and true centre, which would cohere with all like selves in one glorious whole. Such a Centre He offered them in the Will of God, such a Whole in the Kingdom of God. It is not enough, He declared, for the

* Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*
† W. Temple, *Nature, Man and God.*
‡ Taken from *Nature, Man and God.*

evil spirit to be cast out of a man. Unless a new authority takes possession, "the last stage of that man will be worse than the first."

The modern psycho-therapist* has found out the truth of this. If the "phantasy" or dominating complex is dissolved by ruthless analysis, so that the patient can no longer accept it, in many cases the whole personality seems to be at once submerged in a welter of evil chaos. Temporary relief may be found in some new obsession, generally in a curious and disconcerting devotion to the healer. "This," says Herr Jung, "is clearly fed from a source of uncommon strength," and he relates it to the "Father-complex" found in all persons, but is frankly at a loss as to how to deal with it satisfactorily. Not so Jesus, Who was emphatic that the patient must look beyond visible man, even though it were Himself, to the invisible Father Who is the true Centre and Source of our being. He bade the Gadarene go and tell what great things God had done for him,† giving him a purpose on which to focus his reintegrated personality: thus implicitly overcoming the difficulty, which Jung describes, of "building a bridge over which the patient may pass."

It may not be out of place here to urge that an entirely new view of psychological problems is obtained by accepting the principle that our instinctive emotions are really "broken lights" of the relationship which exists between God and His creation. Dr. Jung shudders at the "appalling filth" of the "psychic mind-pool." It is true that there may be vortices of extreme evil in it, but on the whole it is perhaps because he translates its promptings, as does the patient, into terms of flesh. There is in us something which demands an experience in which every instinct is fulfilled as one. This is impossible on the physical plane where emotional force must be broken up among various functions; but if it is seen that this tremendous "libido" is only very partially and imperfectly revealed in the life of the flesh, and its true manifestation must be in the spiritual world, then this difficulty disappears. It is seen to be the shadow of the Divine Father and Son, and Spouse, Who are One, and only by the awful apostasy of man is it harnessed to entirely earthly objects. The unearthly drive, so different from the instincts of the natural animal, burns up the resources of the personality in a "hell" of its own making, when it is squandered on the lusts of the flesh and the pride of the mind. This tremendous energy which burns up the unworthy vortices which cannot sustain it is the "wrath of

* Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.* † Mark v. 19.

God " to which all the mystics testify. It is therefore only by Faith that man can be saved. When the will of man is at one with the Will of God a tremendous power is liberated in him. To the Son all power is given, His servants are armed with His authority. The faith that removes mountains is not a wanton desire but itself a value-judgment, based on God's love and mercy and man's authority under Him, that shews us that because a certain thing should be done therefore it can be done. " If I send them away fasting they will faint by the way," therefore He " took the loaves and brake and gave . . ."

The power of feeling Value is the power of seeing God, of sensing the Divine incarnate in the apparent. Dr. Temple* points out that, for instance, our sense of the absolute claim of Truth is something quite over and above our recognition of the exactness of certain facts. Yet Truth is incarnate in the facts and is only known to us through them. Value can only be known to us by Fact, and then not to the spiritually blind; the Divine can only be seen by being incarnate. The inevitable result of such sight is a movement of the soul in response. The first and indispensable condition of entry into the Kingdom was what Jesus meant by Faith, that condition of heart and mind which made it possible for a man to see God and so have a true judgment of His Will and Power, a stark sincerity and humility, and a singleness of heart that can concentrate on the " one thing needful." This is all that a man can bring to God that is his own, but it is his part in that union which God seeks. There is no true worship without it, it corresponds to the craving in Nature for that which is the complement, and this love for God, Jesus declared to be the supreme business of man.† Value is thus a winnowing fan from which there is no appeal. Not only are there those who make no response because they cannot see, there are those who react in hate; torn by a self-love for which Self is the only incarnation of Value, the spiritual rulers take counsel together against the Lord's Anointed, and it is Judas, one of the Twelve, who betrays Him.

Dimly we are aware that sometimes, beyond its obvious relationship to our everyday world, there is, in some Fact, a sense conveyed of fitting exactly into an eternal order of Reality, to which it witnesses that we also belong. Value and Fact, the Divine and the creature, are so deeply united in Reality that it was inevitable that, at some culminating point in Time and Space, a supreme Fact should possess and reveal all Value. To the ancient Values, Beauty, Truth and Goodness,

* W. Temple, *Nature, Man and God.*

† Mark xii. 30.

Jesus added Life, and claimed, not in vain, that His Life and Words embodied all Value. He was the Way, the Process itself, completed man at one with the Father from Whom He came; Love and Beauty, the Force by which all Creation is; Truth, the bedrock in which all Reason is grounded; He was the very Core of all Being, that which had Life in itself and was the Life of all living, not only that which appeals, Beauty, and that which responds, Love, but the vital energy that moves in both. Modern psychology has a new name for this, the "libido," which is not only the life-instinct as love or desire, but also as self-assertion, mastery over environment, power. This, too, the hall-mark of man, the "Lord of creation," has its proper locus in the Divine.

In the Fourth Gospel we are told that the Lord quoted: "I have said 'Ye are gods'" . . . adding that this applied to those "to whom the word of the Lord came." It would seem, then, that every man was potentially capable of being one with God, only thus attaining the true status of man. We are ourselves conscious of being, at least, dual personalities; but we identify ourselves with the highest we can attain,* or even dream of attaining—our tenderest dreams, our purest aspirations, the moments of selfless devotion, of clear perception, of inspired grace of behaviour, these are our real selves to us. And yet, they are not, but they are the Spirit that dwells in us. They have come from afar, they well up within, "living waters." Is man, then, simply God's chosen vehicle in the material sphere, the cloak He wears, the form He takes?† Is it to this that all Nature climbs and travails and evolves, that in man perfected she should return at last to oneness with the Creator? If what we desire to be immortalized as our "self" is thus the Son of God, and all that is unworthy can be drained away, then the Son of Man is essentially the Son of God.

But how does this spiritual Life come to man? The evolutionist‡ has shewn us how man grew up from the first living cell, the philosopher§ has explained how man acquired self-conscious individuality, the psychologist‖ has taught us how the personality is built up from the "psychic pool": but who can explain that sudden leap of development when what has been but a focus of animal, social, even political ideas and needs, emerges into what seems to be real Existence for the first time? "The good seed are the children of the Kingdom . . . they are sown . . ." It would seem as if at

* W. R. Inge, *God and the Astronomers*; H. G. Wells, *God the Invisible King*.
† C. C. J. Webb. ‡ J. B. S. Haldane, *Science and the Supernatural*.
§ W. Temple, *Nature, Man and God*. ‖ Hadfield, *Immortality*.

some stage in his development man becomes ripe for the seed. He, himself, in his lower, psychic life, is the ground, and its goodness corresponds to his Faith and his freedom from evil vortices. Then comes the Sower and scatters the Seed of God, the Word of Life, ideas which are not vortices in the psychic mind-pool, but Values that are the Reality of which all mind-ideas are but passing shadows, or perhaps psychic incarnations.

One comes to realize that the Gospel Message was not a dealing piecemeal with men's hearts and minds, but one Thing of intense importance*—Life in its entirety. Man had reached a point in his development of, perhaps, cosmic significance, and He Who should accomplish for man that great "leap" on to a new level of existence sought by every means to bring home to man the adjustments he would have to make if he would enter into his Kingdom.

Some modern psychologists† would persuade us that man, in his natural animal state, is the final product of the "libido" or life-urge, and that the activities which they call "sublimation" are only attenuated safety-valves or "releases"; but the poet, the musician, the artist, testify that they find something within themselves which insists on being manifested, even at the cost of "happiness and all that makes life worth living for the ordinary man,"‡ an unutterable Beauty, a Truth about the hidden Reality which underlies this veil of "seeming." Professor Jung is intensely interested in "the creative aspect of life which finds its clearest expression in art." He considers that it represents a "deeper and more impressive experience than human passion" . . . the artist is "collective man," one who "carries and shapes the unconscious psychic life of mankind."§ Then, if art is but a bypath, it is because the Beauty and the Truth can only be fully expressed, with Goodness, in Life itself. This is the meaning of that overpowering urge in man, not "self-expression," but to express perfectly at last in this physical medium the Reality that is God; and Jesus expresses it, revealing to us fully and completely the unutterable that torments our lesser souls with their inadequacy. His words and deeds do not simply manifest individual values, they make a Whole in which there is nothing else than Value incarnate, in which God's love for man and man's love for God are one transport of self-giving, love in action in life. The secret communion of the inner chamber issues in the proclamation from the housetops, the Flame living on the hidden

* Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God.*
† Hadfield, *Psychology and Morals*; and Freud school, quoted by Dr. Jung.
‡ Quotations from *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*
§ *Cf.* H. Bergson in *Creative Evolution.*

Oil gives light to all that are in the house; and the Divine Energy that first thrust up matter into form must go on rising and returning until it comes again to the Divine. "I go to the Father . . . for I proceeded forth and came from God."

From the standpoint of the psychologist Jesus presents an insoluble enigma; the picture of a man whole and sound, a living unity and sureness of action, with an unequalled command over Himself and other men such as they know to be unattainable unless the personality is absolutely faultless.* Yet He is Himself the denial of their theory that the "normal" use of the instincts is absolutely essential to completeness. If we examine how He referred to the instincts we find ourselves learning the secret of His Own Life. The key seems to lie in the reiterated "Ye have heard that it hath been said . . .," ending with the command, "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." The old righteousness is immature and is swallowed up in a far greater whole of holiness. Earthly relationships are temporary and piecemeal, the spiritual life is One, and underlies and pervades all. Therefore, if a man is out of temper with his "brother," he is disturbing the fabric of the Kingdom; if, in yielding to their lure, he is in danger of losing his spiritual birthright, he would do better to deny himself the normal use of his powers than to be ensnared into earthly and physical pleasures. Jesus commanded His followers to call no man their Father upon earth—not that they should reject proper responsibilities, but that they might realize that in Divine sonship was included a far deeper and closer tie between men, an eternal and absolute relationship, even between those already related by the flesh, and if filial devotion clashed with the business of the Kingdom then it must give place to the prior claim.

This Brotherhood of the Divine Son, in a unity with the Father, is probably the basic reality which manifests itself in many "instincts" and their strange, and to the ordinary judgment horrifying, interchangeableness.

Probably the most valuable witness to the spiritual source of the instincts is that of hero-worship. Beginning as dependence on the parent, through appreciation of abstract Value manifested in the individual, it grows into enthusiastic adoration of self-sacrificing devotion to an ideal. Nothing so surely elicits the response of youth as heroism carried to its limits, death for a dream, a "forlorn hope"; if it is on behalf of him or her then the response is absolute worship. This surely rests on a fundamental spiritual reality of Divine self-giving.

* Jung.

Mr. Noyes* points out that if this capacity for uttermost devotion were not in God, then God would be less than man. This was the most potent appeal that could be made to man, death for the sake of a dream, an ideal, that was also his deliverance and life. Nor did Jesus fail to express in His Life and Words the perfection of this instinct; in Him man was perfected as the Image of the Father because as Son He had seen and learnt from the Father, because the Father was in Him manifesting Himself. He urged His disciples to learn and understand and believe this witness of their own hearts, for in following Him, even to the Cross, they should find peace.

What is known to psychologists as the "herd instinct"† seems to have a strong connection with this universal urge towards Sonship. The aim of mysticism seems to be that of losing the personal identity in a greater whole, including all men in God. The result frequently seems to be an experience of dissolving into the "undifferentiated psyche," so that the struggles to overcome or organize the unruly vortices that surround and invade the conscious mind are completely forgotten. The Hindu Yogi aims at death itself, the oblivion of Brahma. Certain psychologists‡ have found that, so far as they have experience of the human mind, there is in everyone a more or less "repressed longing for death"—a strange contradiction to the "instinct of self-preservation." Yet when we see the two, apparently mutually exclusive, instincts at work in Jesus, the difficulty disappears. He, "collective Man," carrying and shaping the unconscious psychic life of mankind, is also Love in Action, the radiant eternal Energy which sustains all creation, the true Kingdom of Heaven, suffering the agony of rebellion and treachery, and He seeks death as the only road to the souls of men, that His indestructible Life may be in them. And this, too, He must do because He works the works of Him that sent forth His Son into the world. Man must progress in the spiritual life from the infantile stage, all dependence and receptiveness, towards a fulness of life in which he is given a share in the adult privilege and power of giving and helping. Full joy can only come when a man is one with the Father in pouring himself out for others. In the Son, as in His Heavenly Father, the dominant instinct must be that of parenthood. Jesus continually impressed on His followers that their main business was to bring forth fruit unto God. This is the proper activity of that urge in man which presses for a continual and practically unlimited expression,

* Alfred Noyes, *The Unknown God.*
† Hadfield, *Psychology and Morals.*
‡ Quoted by J. B. S. Haldane.

that, when interpreted as a physical necessity, is soul and body destroying vice. But the bringing into being, or manifestation in this world, of spiritual "fruits" is something into which the whole ardour and vitality of the complete personality can be incessantly projected. The "fruits" are all the prayers and thoughts and deeds of heavenly love—the incarnation in the psychic and physical worlds of true Value. These have their own Divine vitality and reproduce their like. Is it possible that they become "vortices" of good in the psychic world, capable of becoming part of, or even the "self" of other individuals? As ideas they do undoubtedly play such a rôle: "The Words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." In this way the "psychic pool" would gradually be organized into personalities which are one with the Father and Divine Centre of all things, by the fully adult Son sharing in the creative activity of the Father.

Man, made in the Image of God, must be essentially creative; it is power in the fullest sense that he instinctively craves.* In the Divine Father creation and fatherhood are one River of Life. It is vain, therefore, for man to think to slake his passion for power with the shadows of this world. Herr Jung finds that most of his patients are highly "successful" men who are hopelessly disillusioned with life, finding its prizes to be but dust and ashes, its riches a mockery. Jesus warns men that this is so, and bids them relate themselves to the true Life, in which they will find riches that endure, work that lasts as Value. He bids them love and bless and give, as their Father does, because it is only in manifesting the Spirit and its dominance over "the world" that man experiences the power that satisfies his spirit. The "normal" ways of earthly prestige and authority separate man from the Spirit and therefore from his brethren, frustrating all his proper instincts. In the spiritual realm "to whom much is given, from him shall much be required," and "he that is greatest" shall be "servant of all." It is impossible to pray, truly, for self alone, because prayer is essentially a union of the human and the Divine Will and must therefore issue in a river of blessing as from the self towards others. Only as one is inseparably united in love with those for whom prayer is made can prayer be made for the self. "*Our* Father" is the only possible preliminary to "Thy Kingdom come," because the Kingdom is the Fellowship of Love in Action, the Spirit of God working in all the members of Christ so that there is but one Will being done. As this Will is for sustaining and redeeming all men, its activity is

* Adler, *The Neurotic Constitution.*

always most apparent where evil is at its worst, triumphing over its manifold darkness with the glory of our Emmanuel, and identifying Seeker and Redeemer with the sought and the redeemed: "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage-supper of the Lamb."

Jesus did found the Kingdom of God upon earth, in founding the first fellowship of men with the common purpose of displaying Love in action in human affairs. However far short the Church falls of this ideal in detail, yet in its main purpose and direction it has never failed to maintain this as its true object. Always its spearhead has been where evil is at its worst—among the heathen, the sick, the prisoners, the naked and the hungry, those fast bound in misery and sin.

In this contact with evil is found the proper outlet for the instinct for struggle and fighting which has manifested itself at all animal levels, and the place of fear in the spiritual realm. The first impression produced on the infant is that of its complete dependence on a tremendous being who has all power without menace. It is doubtful if any young creature knows fear until it has experienced the impact of evil. It early shews anger at being frustrated; this is, indeed, simply an organizing factor in the personality to make it more effective in overcoming the obstacle. Fear, on the contrary, is demoralizing and disabling. We are not surprised, then, to find that, whereas Jesus did on occasion express a devastating wrath, He never showed any sign of fear. His reason, given as teaching to His disciples, was that there was nothing which a child of God need fear, but there was much to combat. His own actions were inspired by a wrath against evil which was the complement to His love for good and for His "little children," and, indeed, was the inevitable result of it. In the Gospels He is shewn as continually at war with the Kingdom of Satan, driving out the devils, or evil psychic vortices, and organizing His disciples to do the same. Yet He warned His disciples to "fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Since he constantly assured them of their Heavenly Father's care for them, this must have been meant as a stern warning not to dally with evil, not to ally themselves with what is doomed to destruction. In the purpose of God Fear, which is demoralizing, must disintegrate the organisms built up around evil vortices. But the combat with evil is the very nature of good, it is the purpose of the Kingdom of God on earth.

"Happiness," says Dr. Hadfield,* "is the feeling tone we

* *Psychology and Morals.*

experience when all the instinctive emotions are expressed in harmony." . . . "Joy is the affective tone which accompanies the expression of any one instinct in conformity with the sentiments of the self." Lured by transient gleams of Joy, and vainly demanding Happiness as his birthright, man is seen to be, like all living creatures, perpetually struggling*—with his environment in order to establish himself, with himself in order to manifest something beyond himself; he struggles to live, yet is disquieted by the lure of sleep and death; he craves to display his inmost self, to create astonishment and receive worship, to be separate and distinguished (even if it may be only by some deformity or extreme affliction), to be assured of his own individuality and importance in the scheme of things; yet he is irresistibly drawn to his fellows, to immersion in the herd, to worship and to serve another; in the moment of the triumph and achievement he has so ardently pursued he is aware of disillusionment and satiety and a nostalgia for the struggle; he is impelled to set "ends" for his own accomplishment, yet is never satisfied by their achievement, and is often shattered by a sense of futility: he claims to be free, yet he shrinks from pain and death, which—as Dr. Bosanquet† points out—voluntarily incurred, is the only perfect expression of freedom.

There is only one way of interpreting man's conflicting emotions which satisfies us and makes sense of them. It is that they are the inevitable accompaniment of a Destiny which, although always latent in man, and through all the strata of evolution, yet only becomes manifest in Jesus Christ. Man's Nature is the shadowy expression of the eternal Power, Majesty, Dominion and Glory of the one God, the Creator, the Father Almighty, Who dwells in the Light unapproachable, yet Whose Love streams forth as the River of Life: and he is also the manifestation of the Son, Who, through all the stages of evolution, continually wars with evil, the principle of falsity, disintegration and death, and struggles to organize chaos and darkness into the Divine Likeness; and the Destiny for which, we may believe, he was made, is that which the Master indicated under the symbol of the Heavenly Marriage, the mystic union in which Likeness and Reality become indissolubly One. For the "mystic" who has known the ecstasy of the Divine Spouse there is but one adequate reason for man's awful freedom, one act alone which justifies the agony, the woes it has involved. It is, that in that Day he should not have to come empty-handed, but should be able to bring to the Beloved something which was truly his own, that his gift of his very self should be

* H. Bergson, *Creative Evolution.* † Gifford Lectures.

a real one. It was supremely fitting that He Who was supremely free should also be the innocent victim. The Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world, purchases not only man's freedom for perfect bliss, but also the completion of God's Love, the Divine pleasure for which man was created.

"The Kingdom is at hand"—we have only to knock and its gates are open wide. "The Kingdom is within"—we need not await a future life. Here and now we may begin to experience the Royalty of the Spirit, to share in the Eternal Will and Kingly Reign of God. This is to find a Happiness inexpressible, a Joy beyond the dreams of the earth-bound: for this a man will do well to sacrifice all that he has, and every hope of earthly joys and rewards. "Manifold more," indeed, shall he receive, who enters into the Joy of his Lord, in the ineffable Bridal of Man and the Creative Word.

C. W. Bird.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

There is probably no dogma in the whole museum of Christian antiquities that would seem to have been so finally and yet so quietly exploded as that of the resurrection of the body. No educated person to-day believes that the body which we lay in the grave is that which shall arise triumphant and glorified at the Day of Judgment; and even those of us who maintain that by the term "resurrection of the body" something quite definite and even concrete is meant, do not mean by the term what most of (though certainly not all) the early Fathers, in a less scientific age, seemed to imply. The dogma in its crudest form has never been a part, as such, of orthodox Christian doctrine, and is contrary to scientific possibility and the light of reason alike.

Those who wish the objections to the doctrine in its crudest form put into a nutshell could not do better than read Dr. O. Hardman's White Lectures for 1932.* In that little volume, to which I am greatly indebted throughout this article, the arguments against the belief in a "resurrection of relics" are beautifully crystallized in a few short passages; but one argument should be devastating enough—an argument that is beginning to lose its freshness. Let us suppose that the dead body of A is buried at sea and consumed by fish. This

* *The Resurrection of the Body.* By O. Hardman. (S.P.C.K.)

means that the particles of A's body will, in the process of their digestion, form particles in the bodies of fish. Those fish, or some of them, will in time be consumed by others than A; and so the particles of A's body are incorporated in time by B, C and D. We may well ask whose body this shall be at the resurrection; and it is but one aspect of an analogy which, if we pressed it, would be seen to go like a wedge through the whole of Nature's vast material flux.

There are, however, those of us who are surprised and not a little embarrassed by the refusal of many modern theologians to define what is meant by the "resurrection of the body"—even while cherishing it as a belief; and by the common assumption, not difficult to disprove, that the doctrine of the survival of personality, in the Christian sense, can be equated with that of resurrection. A clause in the Report of the Archbishops' "Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England" exactly, I think, defines the view of people whom I have in mind—both in its strength and in its weakness. Speaking of the "Resurrection of the flesh" the Report here says:

"It expresses with serviceable brevity a truth which ought to be expressed, even though naive interpretations of it may carry suggestions which ought to be discarded. While, in the judgment of the Commission, we ought to reject quite frankly the literalistic belief in a future resuscitation of the actual physical frame which is laid in the tomb, it is to be affirmed, none the less, that in the life of the world to come the soul or spirit will still have its appropriate organs of expression and activity, which is one with the body of earthly life in the sense that it bears the same relation to the same spiritual entity. What is important, when we are speaking of the identity of any person's 'body,' is not its physico-chemical constitution, but its relation to that person."*

Now this has struck me as an admirable definition of the constitution of the soul; but it does not seem to me to answer the description of "resurrection" in any sense whatever; and there are at least two questions that I would like to put, with very great respect, to those who formulated this clause: (1) What is the state of each human personality *between* death and resurrection when it apparently possesses no "appropriate organs of expression and activity"? and (2) What is to become of the material universe if its destiny is so clearly of a temporary nature? Matter cannot, by the very nature of its composition, perish; and it is strange that an age which above all things

* *Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 209.

boasts of its scientific outlook should so easily acquiesce in a doctrine of resurrection that implicitly denies a basic principle of science.

There is, however, a more profound objection to the doctrine of the resurrection that would omit the material universe as we know it—one that is moral and theological; and this is the implication that matter does not stand in need of redemption. For if it be true that this world is a vale of soul-making and nothing more—if the body, once the soul has parted from it, passes from one change to another, finally to be left a part of the great universal rubbish heap (which is the only logical alternative to material resurrection), then we must admit that matter is unaffected by the Incarnation of the Son of God. I admit that a strong case could be made out for this on moral grounds were it not for the fact that everywhere and at all times matter shows signs of sharing in the universal downward drag which theologians speak of as the Fall.

Not only is Nature, although beautiful and in certain aspects benevolent, capable of appalling catastrophes and even guilty of malignancies; but matter at its basic core behaves in an oddly rebellious manner—as though death rather than life were the universal goal. If you heat water it will sink back into cold again as soon as you have left it to itself; and, in its more solid forms, matter will succumb immediately to alien influences—such as dry or damp rot; and is slowly disintegrating the whole while. In animate Nature this material inertia assumes even more distressing forms. "Lilies that fester smell more foul than weeds," says the poet; and the higher we go in Nature the more appalling, the more humiliating, must death and material disintegration appear to be. There is no need to dwell upon the details of this process any more than there is need to dwell upon the normal constitution of our internal anatomy. The whole thing is revolting for a host of reasons, and could not be reconciled with the creation of the God of Beauty unless we admitted that the whole creation went astray at its foundations. For this fundamental bias of inertia in the material universe goes back as far as biological history can take us. Hear what Dr. H. P. Newsholme, Professor of Medical Hygiene in Birmingham University, has to say on this problem. (The italics are his.)

"Why is the course of evolution so painful and so slow? Why is so much effort involved in the emergence into light of these buried qualities even in man, the crown of Creation? The reason is that they have to emerge against cohesive elements in the individual which we might group under the general name of inertia, cohesive elements coming down from remote

ancestry. But man has relatively less of this inertia, and relatively more of elasticity in his reaction to life at his stage of complexity, than beings lower in the scale of life show in reaction to their particular levels; and they in turn have proportionately less inertia than non-living matter. It would, then, be not unreasonable to deduce that *the inertia which obstructs evolution, and which is intensified as we go backwards to the beginning of evolution in matter itself, is a quality bound up with that matter; and that there is something in the inertia of matter itself which obstructs the emergence of the fundamental qualities of living substance and of man.*"*

It may be argued that this downward drag in Nature which makes for death and disintegration with all its revolting accompaniments is but the running down of an organism that must be judged while it is working—not from its "played out" condition. This also applies to our bodily functions. There is nothing revolting to us in the thought of saliva, mucus or excrements, while such form the constitution of our own bodies; but only when they have left us. Dirt is only healthy material in the wrong place; but surely one might retort, on the same shewing, that sin is only a healthy instinct wrongly expressed. There is in Man a tendency to fall into what all that is best in him realizes to be evil; and there is in matter a tendency to fall into what all that is best in him realizes to be evil; and it is hardly reasonable to claim the need of redemption in the one case and deny it in the other.

This need of redemption, that goes right through the whole material creation, from the primæval vapours to the genius of Man at its greatest, does indeed enormously amplify and even intensify the meaning of the Incarnation. We can thus conceive that act of God as reaching down into the very depths of material creation; and can think of the body of the Son of God, when dwelling in the womb of His Mother, as passing through a series of redemptive acts in every flux which His human embryo underwent. It is an extraordinarily powerful and impressive thought—this idea of the Son of God redeeming each stage in the animal creation before He came to birth upon the human level; but we must, if we are to be consistent, realize that a material universe so redeemed could not end in blind extinction—still less be finally overcome by that bias of inertia that Christ overcame in it. What, then, is to be its ultimate goal and how is it to enjoy the benefits of this redemption?

This problem would remain insoluble so long as we are *in*

* *Evolution and Redemption.* By H. P. Newsholme.

the body—simply because, by that very fact, we are prohibited from knowing what are its capacities—were it not for belief in our Lord's resurrection. For the work of redemption, that began at the moment of the Incarnation, was not completed until the morning of the Resurrection. This we who are Christians all believe to be true of the redemption of Man; but those of us who see in our Lord's death upon the cross an act of redemption for all Nature, animate and inanimate, and of that bias in the constitution of matter itself that is productive of evil and not of good, must realize that the resurrection must include the whole material universe. That redemptive act of God, completed on Easter Day, need not take *effect* in the material creation until the final Millennium any more than need the redemption of mankind; but it gives to St. Paul's poetically conceived panorama of Nature's universal tragedy all the force of moral evidence that it could well demand.

"I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."*

Thus St. Paul unites Man and Nature, spirit and body, as shewing a bond from which the redemptive act of Christ can alone release it; and from which we cannot be finally released until the Day of Judgment. The fact that Nature is to share in this redemption certainly need not be taken to imply immortality for the animal creation; but, if it means anything at all, it must surely be taken to imply a using up of that which constitutes the animal creation in "the glory that shall be revealed." In the same sense, though less obviously, St. Paul need not have implied a redemption of the actual body laid in the grave; but the conclusion of the passage means nothing at all if the human body that endures the travail is to have no share in the glory. In fact this passage, which has always struck me as one of the most amazingly brilliant flashes of intuition that the mind of Man has ever experienced, means

* Rom. viii. 18.

nothing at all if the body of this universe is not to have a full share in the life to come.

Now it may be argued that such a belief raises more difficulties than it actually solves; but I am more and more convinced, as I give study to the matter, that all these difficulties resolve themselves into one—the fact that we cannot conceive *how* it will be done; and that is very dangerous ground upon which to reject any belief for which there is moral and philosophical evidence. It is, in fact, one that those who believe in our Lord's own resurrection cannot condemn without imperilling their own consistency. For the consummation of material redemption in the final resurrection of matter, or its sublimation into spirit, is postulated by the resurrection of Christ; and, if the resurrection of Christ is seen to be the cause and anticipation of the final resurrection of matter, that final resurrection may be accepted on the evidence of Christ's resurrection.

It will become clear, in the light of this problem's universal aspect, that the insuperable obstacles in the way of the cruder ideas of bodily resurrection do not even apply. There is no need whatever to believe that the same particles of matter that are laid in the grave are those which will rise at the last day—to join once more the spirit that discarded them at death. That is a view which modern science most utterly repudiates—as I was able to show at the beginning of my article; but there is nothing contrary to the teaching of science in the belief that matter is itself not doomed to final extinction. Rather must the scientist uphold this view—since it is an axiom of scientific thought that matter is indestructible. The universal flux would appear to be unending; and the fact that it is capable only of a final decomposition into light is itself of significance to the theologian.

All speculation on the nature of resurrection bodies must, however, be limited to hypothetical probabilities—since even those who accept the tradition of the Empty Tomb must remember that our Lord's resurrection, though the foundation of our own, was in a very real sense unique. In His case we believe that it *was* the actual body laid in the Tomb that rose again on the third day—whereas we can do no more than speculate upon any precise relationship between our own bodies and the material composition of those bodies with which we shall rise at the final Millennium. Such speculations are ever a snare to some temperaments; but there is one which, however daring, is so well in harmony with the " organizing principle " of Nature as we know it, and with the character of God, that I cannot resist giving it.

We know that, in the eternal flux of nature, nothing is more regular in its operation than the flux which occurs every seven years in the individual body. Nobody reaches old age with the same body as that which he possessed in his prime, nor does anyone achieve maturity in the same flesh wherewith he was born. It would be true to say that most people have possessed enough material to constitute eight or nine bodies by the time they are laid in the grave—that a resurrection of the material species which clothed that soul during its earthly career would not be limited to the body that was laid in the tomb. This would overcome the prime difficulties with which we opened because *they* concerned a doctrine of the resurrection of the identical body laid in the grave; it is surely not unreasonable to suppose that He Who has numbered the hairs of our head, and without Whose knowledge no sparrow falls to the ground, could preserve against our resurrection material from our several earthly bodies that would complete the redemptive process in each individual for himself by providing him in glory with the same body as that in which he passed through his humiliation.

This is, of course, highly speculative—even perhaps dangerously so—however attractive; but what is certain, if organic matter really stands in need of redemption by reason of the moral flaw that is at its foundation, is that organic matter must be delivered from its bondage in the final resurrection. All particles of this universe—every dram of it—have been redeemed by Christ; and we may confidently believe that nothing which is beautiful in Nature or in art, or is in any way worth preservation, will be lost from eternity. The moral implication of this argument is stated with clarity and force by the distinguished scientist already quoted.

" Resurrection, we would submit, is thought to be organic; and it is there that Christ comes in as the factor converting the pessimism of some Eastern philosophies into the hopefulness of assured rehabilitation. In His death He broke the bonds which hitherto held the spirit within Creation at all its levels, from matter to mind and heart and will. Those bonds had shewn themselves in the inertia of sin, evil, suffering, and disease at the higher levels and in the inertia of the physical realm at the level of matter. In removing these bonds Christ enabled both spirit and matter to recover the qualities which originally they had been intended to have."*

That resplendent awakening of the whole universe to its full glory is something that strikes the imagination with its

* *Evolution and Redemption.* By H. P. Newsholme, p. 254.

beauty and power. A fitting climax to the redemptive process—in which sin and pain and the evils of inertia have been for ever destroyed. Artists have vied with one another in picturing its terrors and its glories—just as thinkers have endeavoured to give it meaning in words. Each has partially failed; but we may surely hope that when the spirit of Man goes to his long home and the Kingdom of God is come, the earth that we have loved and lost for a while will not be absent for ever. For it is, I believe, a truly Christian hope that all we have loved here that is in any sense good, or beautiful, or true, will be ours in the world that has no end. The beauties of the sunset and the eyes of a faithful dog—the scent of the rose and the magnificent monuments of men—must assuredly have a place where the God of Beauty reigns supreme.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

MODERNIST CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

BY TWO PRIESTS

AN interesting collection of pictures of modern churches was issued some time ago by the Incorporated Church Building Society. It afforded evidence that churchpeople and the architects whom they consult desire to think for themselves and no longer to be bound by the fetters of the past. Time was when the influence of mediæval forms was all-penetrating, invading domestic as well as ecclesiastical architecture, and many a clergyman, doomed to dwell in a super-Gothic vicarage, is disposed to echo Lord Palmerston's remark on seeing the designs for some Government buildings, "Too much damned Gothic." The Law Courts and the Houses of Parliament are memorable instances of the period; others, less memorable and more melancholy, can be seen in the public institutions of most provincial cities. A break with this tradition was inevitable, but we seem to be swinging rather dangerously over to the opposite extreme. The Exhibition of British Architecture, held a year or so ago at Burlington House, provoked one of the daily papers to remark, "Britain now has churches so modern that . . . one wonders how on earth they can recite, in a building like that, the Liturgy from King James' Prayer Book." It is not clear what Prayer Book is referred to, but the opinion of this writer is shared by many other people.

Churches do not need to be of one particular shape, still less

of one particular style, for the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, but there is something in the prejudice of "old-fashioned folk" that demands respect. Hitherto, there has always prevailed a certain convention that distance and mystery should surround the altar; the meanest church has its chancel and sanctuary, and the altar has been withdrawn and often screened. But from these new buildings most of this has vanished.

It is disquieting to think of these new churches in twenty-five years' time, when the novelty has worn off and shabbiness has taken the place of cleanliness, as it will probably do with the materials employed. Examples can already be seen in two buildings which one of us has visited.

Some of the new churches are undeniably attractive—*e.g.*, St. Francis, Bournemouth; but there is a doubt in the mind of the observer as to whether these churches will be interesting when they cease to be novel. If urban areas are to be covered with them they will become commonplace, or, what is worse, restless in their striving after originality. We can see examples of the latter alternative on the Continent—*e.g.*, the extraordinary façade of the great church in Copenhagen, built in memory of Bishop Grundtvig. Here the structure is deliberately designed to represent an organ! The church at Basle of which Father Hebert gives a picture in *Liturgy and Society* affords another example of self-conscious determination to express, at all costs, the "New Spirit." Father Hebert's observations in his chapter on "Christianity and Art" are valuable and contain much with which we should not venture to disagree, but it is too sweeping to say, "It is a bad sign that churches in the Victorian period were built in Gothic."

The rather commonplace Gothic building was often capable of transformation; there are one or two churches in London where a wise rearrangement of the chancel and sanctuary and the introduction of worthy ornaments and rich colours have made what is practically a new church out of unpromising material. Can this be done with the type of church we are considering? It seems that the aim of the designer has been to prevent this by fitting out the building with all the "instrumenta" of worship, and by making them part of the structure itself in many cases. It will prove exceedingly difficult for future authorities to effect any improvement. The impression left on the mind is that these churches are not meant to grow; the fittings, especially the obtrusive lighting methods, are part and parcel of the building and the whole thing is complete.

It is said that these churches possess practical advantages denied to the old-fashioned structure. One is that of cheapness. One may surely doubt the validity of this criterion, as applied

to a Temple of the All-bountiful God; but, in any case, we note that a good many of the buildings cost somewhere in the region of £12,000 (far more, if our memory is not playing tricks, than the charming Church of St. Basil, Deritend — even when allowance is made for the rise in prices since late pre-War days), and the use of concrete and steel does not always take the place of brick and stone; very often these materials are made to look like concrete, with the result that, as an artist observed, "These places don't look built up so much as poured out."

It is claimed for them, perhaps justly, that the modern type of church has solved the problem of heating and dealing with draughts. This success, however, is hardly to be attributed to the use of a modern style of architecture; it is surely due to the use of modern scientifically planned apparatus, which can quite easily be introduced into new buildings of a traditional type and, less easily perhaps, into ancient buildings.

It is also sometimes claimed that the modern style of church has surmounted acoustic difficulties. If this is true we are bound to admit the value of this feature, but without confessing that acoustics have been invariably bad in olden buildings—many of our village churches provide instances to the contrary. What we should like to have is a table of statistical information shewing what proportion of the new churches, as compared with ancient and Victorian Gothic churches, are acoustically good, bad and indifferent. Only this can substantiate any claim to superiority.

There are more important things than physical warmth and ease in hearing. However difficult or impossible to explain, the fact remains that most Byzantine and Gothic churches, including fairly modern churches in those styles, have a devotional "atmosphere"; while not asserting that a church in the modern style has no such atmosphere, we do claim that its possessing such an atmosphere must be proved by experience—it cannot be proved in any other way. Until empirically satisfied on that point, churchpeople would be prudent if they insisted that only a very few churches should be erected in non-traditional styles. If the modern architecture stands up to that test (in our opinion probably the most important of all criteria) it could be adopted widely. If it does not stand the test, it should be ruthlessly cast aside; a church conducive to prayer is more desirable than one which is architecturally up-to-date. After all, one of the ideals holding a high place among modernist architects is "functionalism," and that, as applied to churches, indicates a devotional atmosphere as one of the main requirements in a church. It is

not for nothing that the leading pioneers of the Gothic Revival were devout churchpeople.

It is often claimed that a church ought to " fit in " with its surroundings, presumably because all life should be in touch with the influence of religion. To this we would answer, firstly, that there are some activities that are barely compatible with Christianity. It is probably a good thing that ecclesiastical architecture is often different from its neighbours; it quietly, but forcibly, suggests that the Church as a God-created society is challenging the world. Of course, in mediæval times there was no different style employed for churches, distinguishing them from " secular " buildings; but that is because the Church's architecture was copied for domestic and other buildings. This is suggestive; men of the Middle Ages were often bad Christians, but Christians they were, for the most part at least. They acknowledged the Church's authority in commerce, family life, etc. (We do not think it can be denied that Gothic was chiefly developed by the Church. The whole question cannot be debated in a short space, but rib-vaulting, buttresses and other leading features of Gothic made their first appearance in churches.) Now that men are largely in revolt against Christian moral and dogmatic standards, it is undesirable that the Church should follow and not lead the world—modern architecture does seem to us to have been developed in answer to the needs of factories and offices, in so far as it is not the result of a desire to throw off all that reminds men of the past.

Secondly, we consider that the generality of mankind, the ordinary men who are not experts, like the antique. The learned may frown and storm, but when a non-expert is able to choose a house, he more often than not wants " something Tudor "—hence the scorn of highbrows on borough councils and schools of art. The ordinary man may be hopelessly stupid, but the Church has to take account of him as well as of the expert. So the Church's Temples should not be entirely designed to " fit in " with those factories from which the population like to escape to their " antique villas."

To be consistent, we think that the moderns should demand the rejection of ancient standards in other forms of ecclesiastical art besides the architectural and cognate ones. They should insist upon the drastic revising of the Prayer Book and the discarding of outdated, though majestic, wording. " Amen " might be supplanted by " Says you," and the Creeds might begin " I'll tell the world."

It must not be supposed that we have any desire to attack all that is not Gothic. The examples of Gothic in the book to which we adverted at the commencement of this article are

not all very inspiring. What we are attacking is the idea that the Church must be up-to-date at all costs. What we believe, and have reason to think that many others agree with us in believing, is that the principles underlying the application of modern architectural styles to ecclesiastical buildings are in need of careful scrutiny and that the ancient styles are capable of fresh study and employment.

Lastly, in view of the expected decrease in the population of this country, it may be suggested that to be content with a spacious temporary Mission Church may be a wiser policy at the present time than to add one more to the series of singular structures which may express the " new spirit " but bid fair to depress, if not destroy, the soaring spirit of worship.

THE BIBLE TODAY

THE four-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the English Bible calls general attention to a singular phenomenon, the victory of the Bible over time. I am not wanting to make capital out of the fact that, amid the tumultuous spate of modern books, which kill one another and bewilder us, the Bible continues to have a very large and constantly increasing sale. It is indeed very moving to hear from the Bible Society of Bibles bought eagerly in China and in all parts of the world by people who have no other motive than desire to find out what the Bible has to say. But it happens in our own land, and wherever there is a settled Christianity, that copies of the Bible are constantly received by young people as presents. This often is not in response to any specifically formulated demand. Accordingly, the immense circulation of the Bible has a margin of what may be called unverified significance.

But, quite apart from the mere size of its circulation, it is a marvel that the Bible has overleaped the centuries, and that an ancient book is understood and prized by innumerable people, learned and simple, of the modern world. It is desperately hard for anything ancient to maintain its appeal *both* directly, *in propria persona* so to say, *and* on a large scale. I can think of nothing ancient except the Bible which has achieved the double victory. The Roman Empire survives, in a diffused form, as it has affected the course of civilization. Greek tragedy survives in itself, as it was, but only for the few; it is

valued by the scholarly. But the Bible, for all its ancient, Oriental dress, has stepped clean across the gulf of time, and we can all see it as it is, and hear it as it speaks. It has outlasted the old gods, it has prevailed over the world-conquerors. For everyone who knows something about Alexander there are perhaps a thousand who know something about David. As Goliath in stature, Alexander was a giant in power. Earth trembled as he walked. But David has outlived him.

When it comes to the climax of the Bible, the story of Bethlehem, the story of the Upper Room, the story of Calvary, the story of the Easter Garden where a quiet Voice named a name, and a woman's heart stood still for joy, these stories have found their way into the mind and memory of man. There are, here and there, literary families whose conversation puzzles strangers because they seem to speak of the characters of some favourite writer, say Jane Austen, as if they were in the next room. But there are millions of people, not specially gifted with other than the gifts of grace, to whom Our Lord and those who with Him live for ever in the pages of the Gospels are not merely, as it were, in the next room, but are part of that abiding revelation, that daily companionship, which, as the Bible says, is the word of God, very nigh them, in their mouth, and in their heart, that they may do it.

The quality which has created this result can be variously described. But it is by common consent unique. If there were no Bible, that which we have from the Bible would have come to us from no other quarter. It was printed once for all in the life of a small community, and the type was broken up.

Remember some of the great passages of the Bible. Job xxviii., Psalm li., Isaiah liii., the last three chapters of St. Luke, the 14th 15th, 16th, 17th chapters of St. John, the first fourteen verses of the first chapter of St. John; the end of Romans viii. What do they tell the world? I did not choose them for their literary beauty, great as that is. I am, to say the truth, a little tired of hearing of the literary merits of the Bible. It is rather like being told that your wife or your mother is a respectable woman. True enough, most likely, but there is another whole region which the pedestrian testimonial fails to touch.

I chose those passages, as any Christian would, because they reveal that about God which we should not otherwise have known. The Bible reveals that God is the Living God, who does things. There are modern non-Biblical approaches to belief in God. They have their value, but in contrast to the Biblical approach, they seem to reach God as an End. They find in God that wherein all things cohere, the ultimate Sustainer

of all values and ideals, the Principle of Concretion, the Reason why things are as they are. It is good to find an End which gives satisfaction to the mind. But meantime, according to the Bible, God is a Beginning. You do not reach God. He comes to meet you. And by that test, I am myself accustomed to measure the wisdom of the wise. It may be important, interesting, and intellectually convincing. But if I am asked to accept it as my religion, that by which I am going to order my life, I lay it beside the simple, satisfying affirmations of the Bible. Does it set me in the presence of the Living God?

What the Bible says about the Living God is that He has visited and redeemed His people. I can remember John Neville Figgis quoting that verse of the Benedictus as the text of his first Hulsean Lecture at Cambridge thirty years ago. And then he added. "Has He? That is the question." He was right. It is indeed a question. It is the question of questions. Many people think it is insoluble. Some think that the answer is probably "No." But the Bible, having considered the matter, knowing the difficulties, knowing a great deal about both suffering and sin, nevertheless makes answer "Yes."

The Living God. Never be misled into supposing that Christianity consists of "the Teaching of Christ." Christianity is a Gospel. It is News, Tidings of Something that has happened, Something that God has done, and if you don't know it, you are out of date, behind the times. If you don't know it, and are pessimistic, you are still crying, with Archimedes, "Give me something to stand on." If you don't know it and are optimistic, you have been comforting yourself with the vain superstition that evolution is peacefully progressing and that we shall, by slow degrees, float into the kingdom of the future. But the true kingdom of the future is not reached by drifting—not even if you call it development, no, not even if you call it the integration of potentialities. The door of it is flung open by the great creative Acts of God, as when God said, "Let there be light," and there was light. Or when God "spake by the prophets." Or when God "did not abhor the Virgin's womb." Or when Satan, strong man armed, secure in his expensive palace, was met on Calvary and overcome by One still stronger, who took from him all his armour wherein he trusted and divided his spoils. Or when a stone was rolled away and a new thing was born, the revelation that Death, our common master, is only the Lord's servant after all.

And this is Christianity. It is not "Be good." It is not "Let us have great purposes, and cling to high ideals." It is

the story of the Acts of God, the Events which are recorded in the Creed.

Do you remember that I said, "the God who does things"? Not "has done" or "did," but "does." One of the worst results of reading the Bible would be to suppose that God was like that once, in "Bible times," but things are different now. There is indeed a kind of mental translation that everyone must make from a strange language in using the Bible. The Bible says, for example, that the thunder is God's voice. Well, so does Wordsworth. But Wordsworth is intellectually sophisticated. He is modern enough and scientific enough to know that there are such things as secondary causes, conditions of the atmosphere. That is the way in which God works. This is one of the mental translations that everyone must make, so as to consider secondary causes as well as the Primary cause. Another is this: It is not wise to talk of special Providences unless you have a rather deep experience of what is rightly called the guided life. If Mr. Jenkins is accidentally prevented from taking a certain train, and that train is afterwards wrecked, some of his friends may think it a special Providence for Mr. Jenkins, and say, "How nice for him!" But it is not so simple as all that. There is still the problem of the other people who were in the train. Divine Providence is not a thing to be lightly looked for every now and then, when you happen to be interested. It is a thing which lasts all the time. Most of us do not deserve to talk of special Providences. They are to be recognized, not by the casual and self-centred outlook of a Mrs. Jenkins who has never thought about it much but does assume that her husband has a first claim on God's consideration. They are to be recognized by those who have always schooled themselves to find God in the thoughts that visit them, in the things they suffer and enjoy.

Allowing for what I have called these two indispensable translations, if you can bring to it some science and some spiritual experience, this is the real Bible faith, that God has once for all broken in upon our order, and that the spiritual current thus engendered has not been turned off at the main. The life of man is a live wire. The Church, always throughout the whole Bible the People of God, and then, in the fulness of time, recreated as the Body of Christ, not only thinks, as someone has put it, God's thoughts after God, but does Christ's work not after Christ, but with Christ. He who is the real Priest at every Eucharist, the real Prophet behind every worthy sermon, is also the real Actor in all faithful citizenship, all rightly ordered life. The pain that I hope you feel about Abyssinia, your happiness at every victory of justice or mercy

over cruelty, your brave thoughts and patient deeds, those are the works that Christ does in you, they are done while Christ and you—

> the sinless and the sinful one
> Together tread strange roads beyond the stars.

Beyond the stars, because whatever our Lord does has infinite value. And yet not off the ground of earth at all, because whatever is done is done on the roads of our pilgrimage. For the Gospels relate the coming of divine redemption, of infinite meaning, into man's life. The remainder of the New Testament shews what was made of it. Jerusalem and Corinth come at the beginning, and London occurs for the first time on a later page; that is all. The New Testament Christians are just like London Christians, Japanese Christians, German Christians. The first Epistle to the Corinthians is about the things which are happening in every parish every week. The second Epistle to the Corinthians would be a rich treasure of material if it were ever discovered, as I hope it never will be, by the modern psychological novelist. The Epistle to the Romans, hard as it is to understand, throws powerful light on most of the things that most of us most want to know. I have often thought that there is even a peculiarly Anglican atmosphere about the Epistle to the Philippians. St. Paul is as contemporary as all that!

And this becomes possible because the story told in the Gospels is not a story which once happened and then came to an end. It is the Introductory Volume to a long, long history in many volumes, which is not yet nearly finished. There are blots in all the volumes, save the first, there are mis-spellings, grammatical errors, untidy writing, untrue statements, pages which deserve to be torn out. But always, as we sigh over an unfortunate entry, a spoilt page, or laboriously trace a line or two of fresh penmanship, we can turn back to Volume One. "Did not our heart burn within us?" said the two men at Emmaus. It is commonly quoted as a text about the Bible, as indeed it is—"While he opened to us the scriptures." But it is also a text about life, about going for walks, about conversation, about friendship, about hospitality. And it can be translated into the present tense, because the Incarnation is not a Visit, but a Domicile, and the Bible is about the things that our Lord is doing now. "Does not our heart burn within us, while He talks with us by the way?" And the words that He speaks unto us, they are spirit, and they are life.

S. C. C.

MISCELLANEA

"OUTSIDE THE CHURCH."

SIR,

I am glad indeed that one for whom I have so much admiration as I feel for Mr. Arnold Lunn disclaims holding "the odd view that all is darkness outside the Church"; but I cannot be blamed for supposing that this *was* his view. For in his book *Now I See*, a controversial apologetic for his conversion to the Roman Church, Mr. Lunn closes with a paragraph from Mr. Hilaire Belloc's *Essays of a Catholic* in which he practically makes a statement of that view. In speaking of the Church that paragraph does not leave room for light beyond the Church; but says—"there is a city full, as are all cities, of halt and maim, blind and evil and the rest; but it is the city of God. There are not two such cities on earth. There is One. One thing in this world is different from all other. It has personality and force. It is recognised, and most violently loved or hated. It is the Catholic Church. Within that house the human spirit has roof and hearth. Outside it is the night." If "outside it is the night" does not mean "outside it all is darkness" I would like to know what it *does* mean. Perhaps I should have quoted Mr. Belloc rather than Mr. Arnold Lunn as holding "this odd view," but it was Mr. Lunn who made controversial capital out of it. Now that he has repudiated the view which it implies, perhaps he will feel that he ought publicly to repudiate Mr. Hilaire Belloc's statement of it.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

WORLD CALVINISM AT EDINBURGH

FROM the 6th to the 11th of July a somewhat unusual collection of men met together at Edinburgh—Americans, Frenchmen, Swiss, Central Europeans, Dutchmen, Englishmen, Scots, South Africans, and even Australians and New Zealanders. The occasion of this gathering was the Fourth International Congress of Calvinists. It is only since 1932 that these Congresses have taken place, the first being held at London in that year, the second at Amsterdam in 1934, and the third at Geneva in 1936.

The Congresses of Amsterdam and London were chiefly notable for making a larger number of people aware of an interesting development that has taken place in Holland. A group of Calvinists in that country have established a "Free University," which is organized on the assumption that Calvinism is no mere religious system but a viewpoint which is all-embracing, in the sense that there must be not only a Calvinistic theology but also a Calvinistic jurisprudence, a Calvinistic politics, a Calvinistic philosophy, and even a Calvinistic physics. Another peculiarity of this Dutch group which was brought out particularly clearly during the Amsterdam Congress is their refusal to accept the statement that the dogma of the Sovereignty of God is the "essence or basic

principle of Calvinism." One of their reasons for denying this is that they define Calvinism as "consistent Christianity"—Christianity which follows out every single one of its distinctive tenets right to the very end, and not merely a particular one such as the Sovereignty of God. Another reason is that the Sovereignty of God is a fact concerning the relation between God and other beings, and the "Free University" group consider that all such doctrines are essentially less fundamental than "ontological" ones which deal with God as He is in Himself. Both Schleiermacher's theology and Kierkegaard's are rejected as "relation-theologies," the former being built around a relation of practical identity between God and His creatures, and the latter around a relation of absolute difference. One of the most interesting features of the Amsterdam Congress was a debate on this point between Professor Hepp of the Free University and Professor Haitjema of Groningen, who holds that theology cannot but be a "relation theology" because of its fundamental dependence on Revelation.

The central issue at the Geneva Congress, the main subject of which was the doctrine of Election, was a clash between "Barthianiasm" and Calvinism of the more rigidly conservative type. Dr. Peter Barth's very lengthy opening address on "The Biblical Basis of Calvin's Doctrine of Predestination" did much to substantiate some of the speculations of Brother George Every in the *Criterion* as to the possibility of giving a "Catholic" interpretation to Barthianism. Peter Barth is Karl Barth's younger brother, and his "magnum opus" is an edition of some selected works of Calvin which he produced in collaboration with Wilhelm Niesel at the time of the Stockholm Conference. His address at Geneva was evidently to a large extent the result of his labours on this work, for the greater part of it consisted of a comparison between Calvin's treatment of the doctrine of election in successive editions of the Institutes. In the 1536 edition, Barth pointed out, the doctrine was essentially bound up with faith in the Catholic Church, and, above all, with the Divine Mercy, while in the later editions there was an increasing "hardening" and a more and more definite and rigid conception of the division of mankind from all eternity into "elect" and "reprobate." The address concluded with the very definite expression of the opinion that the treatment of the first edition was more in accordance with Scriptures than the later expositions, and was therefore to be preferred to them. A rare hornets'-nest was raised in orthodox Calvinistic circles by this paper, and the Report of this Congress is a document well worth possessing.

The Edinburgh Congress, which met to discuss "The Reformed Faith and its Ethical Consequences," was not so much of a straight-out debate between clearly defined opponents as those at Amsterdam and Geneva tended to be. The variety of thought represented alike in its speakers and in its other delegates seemed to be too great for any such division to find very clear expression. The conflict between Barthianism and "orthodox" Calvinism formed a curious controversial undertone to some of the papers, but seldom found direct expression in debate. One of the ways in which it made itself felt was in the vigour with which Calvinistic orthodoxy defended "natural theology," particularly in the form of the doctrine of "common grace," against any who might come forward to oppose it. Not only Barth but Brunner also made far too little of "common grace," according to one Dutch speaker.

On the subject of "common grace," one suggestion was made with which I imagine particular sympathy will be found in certain quarters in the Church of England. Dr. P. J. Kromsigt, of the National Church of Holland, put forward in the course of a discussion the view that "common grace" is not merely the grace of God the Creator but the grace of Christ. This idea seemed to be an echo of F. D. Maurice, and also of one of the sayings of Father Zossima in *The Brothers Karamazov* about Christ having been with the flowers and the birds and the beasts, and not only with men—"Christ has been with them before us." In his further development of the thought Dr. Kromsigt showed a still more definite point of contact with Anglicanism. He stressed the fact that Christ is not only the Head of the Church but also of all the nations—a fact which is emphasized by Hooker.

The variety of standpoints that were represented at Edinburgh can hardly be better indicated than by mentioning that one of the speakers at a public meeting was Professor G. D. Henderson of Aberdeen, whose recent work on *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* displays a definite sympathy towards a moderate form of episcopacy in Church government. In his address his basic loyalty to the sixteenth-century Reformation was made equally plain. I am fairly certain that there are people in the Church of England whose fundamental outlook is the same as Professor Henderson's, and it seems a pity that some of them were not present at the Congress. Calvinism has a "High Church" and a "Low Church" form in Scotland; and I am not sure that the same is not increasingly true of England—the chief difference being that English High Churchmen prefer not to call themselves Calvinists. At all events, there is at least as much (I should personally say far more) of the real spirit of Calvin in the serious fidelity to the Scriptures and to the Thirty-nine Articles of such "Catholics" as the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, as in the Anglican Evangelical "party line," which seemed to be the only type of Anglicanism represented at Edinburgh. Is it too much to hope that this will be among the varieties of "Calvinism" appearing at the next Congress? It is worth remembering—by "Calvinists" and "Anglicans" alike—that it appeared at the Synod of Dort.

ARTHUR N. PRIOR.

THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER IN THE SYNOPTISTS *AND* THE FOURTH GOSPEL

IT is usually stated that there is a disagreement between the first three and the Fourth Gospel on this point; that the first three Gospels date the Last Supper as being on the Passover Day, and the Fourth as being on the day before the Passover. St. Mark xiv. 12 says, "On the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, the disciples say unto Him, 'Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare that Thou mayest eat the passover?'" This suggests at first sight that the preparation began on Nisan 14th at 3 p.m., the time when the Passover lambs were killed in the Temple, and that the Paschal meal took place on the same evening. With this SS. Matthew and Luke appear to agree. St. John, on the other hand, states (xiii. 1) that the Last Supper was "*before* the Feast of the Passover"; and that on the following morning

the Jews would not enter the Prætorium " that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover " (xviii. 28). This apparent discrepancy on such a vital date is a most serious matter, suggesting that either the Synoptic tradition or the Fourth Gospel is quite unreliable in historical detail. It may be added that few commentators on the subject make it clear to the layman that the Jewish day begins at sunset, and so, if he perchance remembers this fact, an impression of confusion is at once created in his mind! The Passover lambs were killed in the afternoon of the 14th, and eaten on the evening of the same natural day; but as the Jewish day began at sunset, that was already Nisan 15th.

Allen in his commentary on St. Matthew says that St. Mark's chronology is hopelessly confused, because " the first day of unleavened bread " was really the day *after* the eating of the Passover-meal. One can only answer, that if St. Mark was *so* confused, the chronology is so nonsensical as to be impossible; and one must suppose that by " the first day of unleavened bread " he meant the *day before the Passover-meal*, the day on which all leaven was by custom carefully removed from the houses—*i.e.*, Nisan 14th—and also that his readers would understand that this was his meaning.

One must notice that " when " (ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον) in St. Mark xiv. 12 refers properly to the day, not to the hour (which would be denoted by ἡνίκα). Perhaps the conjunction ὅτε *could* refer to the hour, but it certainly need not do so.

This paper suggests that there is no discrepancy between the Synoptists and the Fourth Evangelist, but that the latter is right, and the former agree with him. One must suppose that the first readers of St. Mark had sufficient knowledge of Jewish customs, and perhaps sufficient memory (at first or second hand) of the closing events of our Lord's earthly life, not to be misled as to the date, as modern writers seem to have been. The whole of the events from the preparation of the Last Supper to the Death of Christ took place on Nisan 14th, and He died at 3 p.m., at the hour when the Passover lambs were being killed in the Temple. The words of St. Mark xiv. 12, " On the first day of unleavened bread, the day on which they killed the passover," refer primarily to the question of the disciples, and the despatch of two of them to prepare the meal; but they really qualify the whole narrative from this point to the Saviour's death and burial.

Jesus deliberately kept " the Passover " (as He calls it) a day before the usual day, because He knew that the Jewish authorities wished to arrest Him " not on the Feast-day " (St. Mark xiv. 2), but, if possible, before it. He wished to eat the Last Supper with His disciples, without disturbance from " the Jews," and He wished it to be regarded as a Passover, because in it He wished them to understand that He was giving them (in the Sacrament) the Flesh of *the* Paschal Lamb—namely, Himself. The preparations were hurried, and began at nightfall, for the sake of secrecy. Judas was to be there, but he was not to know the place beforehand, for fear that he might betray it to the Chief Priests. So the Lord planned to secure Himself from arrest until after the Supper. The Supper had been *already* planned with the unknown friend (the " man bearing a pitcher of water ") who had the room prepared beforehand (ἐστρωμένον ἕτοιμον, Mark xiv. 14). Then, when it was " late," the Supper began and Jesus unmasked the traitor, while he was present, and for the moment could not cause an interruption.

SS. Matthew and Luke, writing later, add a few pointers, to make the date clearer to those who might have a less clear knowledge of the incidents of the night and day. In St. Matt. xxvi. 18 Jesus said, "Go to the city to such a man and say, 'The Master saith, *My time is at hand*; I keep the Passover in thy house with My disciples." Matt. xxvi. 2 suggests that Jesus expected to die at the time of the killing of the Passover lambs: "ye know that after two days the Passover cometh, and the Son of Man is betrayed to be crucified." St. Luke xxii. 14: "When the hour came, He reclined at the table, and the apostles with Him; and He said to them, 'With desire I have desired to eat *this* passover with you *before I suffer*; for I say unto you that I shall not eat it (*i.e.*, the proper, Nisan 15th, Passover) until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God" (*i.e.*, until the Sacrifice of *the* Passover Lamb, Himself, is consummated). Note that the chronology here suggested gives far greater point than is otherwise possible to Luke xxii. 7: ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων ἢ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα (for ἔδει *cp.* Luke xxiv. 26, and note that the *passive* infinitive directs attention to the Paschal *Victim*).

As the Last Supper took place on the night before the killing of the lambs, it is probable that the customary Paschal lamb was absent. If so, its absence would make clearer our Lord's teaching that the true Paschal Lamb was Himself.

It is worth while to add that the customary release of the prisoner "at the Passover season" (κατὰ τὴν ἑορτήν, Mark xv. 6) is more likely than not to have been timed so that the released man would be able to eat the Passover with his family or friends.

Hence, we conclude that the supposed discrepancy between the Synoptic and Johannine chronologies disappears; the historical credibility of the Gospels is hereby greatly strengthened, and the Synoptic narratives gain much in point and clearness.

J. H. McCubbin.

PRAYER AT THE BURIAL OF THE ASHES AFTER CREMATION

By Henry Scott Holland

(*See "Memoir and Letters" of Henry Scott Holland, by Stephen Paget, p.* 308)

Almighty and most merciful God, Who hast made us out of the dust, that we may live in the Spirit: Whose love is a consuming fire to cleanse and purify: we commend to Thy keeping the soul of Thy servant . . . that he may abide in Thy pardon and peace: and here we lay in the kindly earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, all that is left in our hands of the body in which he shewed himself alive, to our love and delight.

Grant, O dear Lord, that in the day of Thy coming, he may be reclothed in spiritual vesture: so that once again we may know him as of old, and may see his face, and hear his voice, and touch his hand: that he may be to us all that he has ever been, only changed and hallowed by Thy transfiguring power: in the one Body, by the one Spirit; that, together, we may praise Thy Holy Name for ever and ever: through Jesus Christ our Redeemer and our King.

REVIEWS

EXAMINATION OF MCTAGGART'S PHILOSOPHY. Volume II. In two parts. By C. D. Broad, Litt.D., F.B.A. Cambridge University Press. 45s.

In Vol. I. of this work, which was published in 1933, Professor Broad harried McTaggart's philosophy through 516 pages, and claimed to have mortally wounded it in over twenty distinct places; in Vol. II., which consists of two separately bound parts, the dead horse is flogged through a further 872 pages, in the course of which it receives something like a score of *coups de grâce*. To say this is not to imply that the production of the second volume has been a waste of time, for in examining any philosophical system it is important to know not only whether the system as a whole is true or false, but what is to be said as to the truth and falsehood of the elements of which it is composed, and in any case what is worth doing at all is worth doing well. The chief impression that one receives from the 1388 pages of this monumental work (and it is monumental in more than one sense, since it stands on the grave of McTaggart's particular kind of pluralistic idealism) is one of immense admiration for the unflagging perseverance and amazing lucidity of Professor Broad's analysis. St. Thomas More would perhaps have been content to dismiss the book with the remark that it was as Broad as it was long; St. Thomas Aquinas would have been lost in admiration at a work which could rival some of his own in thoroughness and clarity, if not perhaps in profundity.

In Vol. I. of *The Nature of Existence* McTaggart claimed to have proved that the universe consists of primary parts, which are spiritual selves. By an elaborate "Principle of Determining Correspondence" these parts, by perceiving themselves and one another, non-temporally sub-divide themselves into parts, which are their perceptions, and, in a similar way, further subdivide these parts into parts by perceiving the parts already produced, and so on without end. In fact—

> Great parts have little parts
> Within 'em, and they sight 'em,
> Splitting into lesser parts,
> And so *ad infinitum*.

In Vol. I. of his *Examination*, Professor Broad claimed to have shown that this conclusion is false.

In Vol. II. he examines McTaggart's Vol. II., though not quite in McTaggart's order. He first of all examines McTaggart's psychological and epistemological views, according to which all kinds of non-perceptive ostensible experiences, whether knowings, judgings, supposings, emotions, volitions, or what not, are really misperceived perceptions (or, as Professor Broad would say, misprehended prehensions). This conclusion is rejected as unproven and unlikely, as is also McTaggart's theory that all the primary parts of the universe are selves.

He next considers McTaggart's theory of time, which holds that the "A-characteristics" of past-present-future and the "B-characteristics" of earlier-later are really due to misperceptions of non-temporal "C-series." A C-series is an "inclusion-series"—*i.e.*, a series each of whose terms includes all its successors, like the separate members of a set of "Chinese boxes," and the terms of it are parts into which any self is divided in a dimension which is not the same as the one in which it is divided in the determining-correspondence hierarchy. The more inclusive terms are misperceived as later; the most inclusive is the self itself, which from any temporal standpoint appears as a future eternal state at the end of time, but which is really timeless. All this Professor Broad considers to be unfounded and most unlikely. Incidentally there is in chap. xxxvi. a delightful discussion of error, in which the position of the sceptic that there can be no veridical cognitions is dismissed with the conclusion that "either no one believes it or it is false."

There follows a discussion of McTaggart's views on immortality and God. McTaggart held that the soul is both pre-existent and immortal, that it goes through many incarnations, and that there is no God. He was, as Professor Broad remarks, neither a wistful agnostic nor an indignant atheist. Professor Broad agrees with McTaggart about God, but not about the soul. He has, it may be remarked, some funny ideas about the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, though he does his best to be fair to the traditional arguments for the existence of God and shews a far deeper understanding of, for example, the cosmological argument than McTaggart did. But he never gets to grips with them, largely through a lack of comprehension of what the Christian teaching about God is; he has, however, no doubt that McTaggart was an atheist. It may here be remarked that the weak point of McTaggart's thought about God, as of much else in his philosophy, seems to lie in the fact that he had no real conception of the theory of degrees of being. When he had proved that something was not absolute being, he assumed that it was not being at all,

and in consequence he had an almost Bradleian facility in rejecting realities as appearances.

Finally Dr. Broad examines McTaggart's theory of value, according to which the maximal term of a C-series is one of supreme value (that is, in temporal terms, that we end up in heaven and not in hell). This, also, he dismisses as unproven.

Thus he completes the task which he describes as "building a mausoleum and composing an epitaph for McTaggart's philosophy." It was in execution, if not in intention, a five-year plan, and more successful than some, and now he intends to leave McTaggart for a while. And, though he disagrees with almost all of McTaggart's views except his atheism, he has an enormous admiration for McTaggart's intellect. If McTaggart failed to construct a pluralistic idealism, who can succeed? And with pardonable vanity Professor Broad gives himself a little pat on the back. "I derive," he says, "a certain satisfaction from reflecting that there is one subject at least about which I probably know more than anyone else in the universe with the possible exception of God (if he exists) and McTaggart (if he survives)." Those of us who accept both these hypotheses may hope that the divine grace and the prayers of McTaggart may avail for the conversion of Professor Broad. For the philosopher whom he most resembles in the clearness of his style and the orderliness of his argument is St. Thomas Aquinas, and, as we remarked in reviewing the first volume of this work, if Dr. Broad eventually turns his attention to theodicy the results may well be surprising.

E. L. Mascall.

The "Truth" of the Bible. By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D. Heffer and S.P.C.K. 9s.

What is the value and meaning of the Old Testament for the present age? The question is an important one. For if the Old Testament has no real meaning except as a collection of materials for the history of ancient Palestine, it is obvious that the attention paid to it in the traditional teaching of theology in schools and universities is grossly excessive. But there are many who have serious doubts whether it has any real meaning. Even among Christians there are many who feel that the decay of allegorical and typological interpretation of the Old Testament, and the abandonment of the mechanical interpretation of prophecy, leave little meaning to the Old Testament passages read in the services of the Church; the traditional teaching as to sacrifice and atonement is often regarded as a mere attempt to preserve obsolete methods of thinking.

Professor Cook has rendered a real service both to religion and to theology by this book. It is indeed rather a collection of essays and papers than a book, and consequently there is much repetition of the same thoughts. Nor, it must be admitted, does he write in an easy or popular style; this is a book which it is very difficult to read in a desultory fashion. But it is a book of first-rate importance, embodying the mature reflections of a life devoted to the teaching and study of the Old Testament. Professor Cook adopts a radical position in Old Testament criticism. Hebrew literature, apart from a few venerable fragments, begins with the prophets, who themselves are a particular instance of a great ethical and spiritual movement, ranging from Greece to India (there are suggestive hints as to possible causal connections), about the sixth century B.C. The "historical" books represent in the main the process by which, after the return from the Exile, the work of the prophets was codified and systematized in the monotheism of Israel; Joshua and Judges are of more value as describing the return of the exiles and the infiltration of desert tribes at that time than as narratives of a supposed conquest by the children of those who left Egypt at the time of the "Exodus." (I could wish that Professor Cook had discussed the extent to which the whole Exodus story is an "ætiological myth" to explain the feast of the Passover.) Thus the Old Testament is really the story of the development of Judaism, leading up to the great crisis of the first century A.D., when Judaism turned its back on the teaching of Jesus, and divided itself into two parties, one of which sought to establish a kingdom of God on earth by violence, while the other succeeded, so far as the Jewish nation was concerned, in enforcing a system of observance of the Torah, and so producing a permanent system of religion which had no vitality outside the limits of the nation. Thus the Bible is the story of how the apprehension of the revelation of the one true God took effect in Israel; and further the story of how Israel failed to live up to their vocation at the time of the Incarnation, so that the kingdom of God was taken from them and given to the Church. Since religion stands or falls with Christianity the Bible is thus the story of man's religion at two great crises, which are typical of the whole history of religion. At the present day it possesses a supreme importance, since Christianity is again faced with a crisis. In the face of rival ideologies and a vast change in man's outlook on life the Church must either rethink what it means by the terms "God" and "Christ" or run the risk of decaying, as Judaism has decayed, into a limited sect.

This is Professor Cook's message, summarized into a form

which entirely fails to do justice to the breadth of his thought or the width of his learning. I entirely agree with it. The modern generation of young men has lost interest in the controversies of the pre-war (properly I believe it ought to be the " pre-depression ") era. They are keenly interested in religion, but they are looking for a religion which will guide them in such questions as the relation of the Church and the Christian to pacifism and communism, a religion which will guide them through the intellectual chaos of the present. Professor Cook points out that the history of human religion is a history of progress where man has lived up to his vocation, and decay where he has failed and allowed religion to be stifled by the symbols and forms in which it expressed itself to past generations; the truth has been overlaid by the forms in which, at an earlier age, it found its right and proper means of expression. He gives no solution to our present problems; it is a great thing that one who has devoted his life to the study of antiquity should see in it a challenge to rethink religion in a form which will commend it to the future. Of his own position there can be no doubt; his noble peroration may be quoted as expressing his faith: " Of all symbols the Cross stands on a hill, apart. It is the crowning symbol of all who testify and bear witness to their ultimate truth; it speaks also of seeming failure, disappointment and disillusion; it tells of daily burdens, not known to others, but not borne alone; and it is the assurance that it is not men alone whose concern is with the history and conditions of men, but that behind and above all is the divine love."

WILFRED L. KNOX.

NOTICES

THE CHRIST OF THE GOSPELS. A Study of the Gospel Records in the Light of Critical Research. By P. Gardner-Smith, B.D. Heffer. 8s. 6d.

This book represents with extraordinary fidelity that tradition of "Critical Research" on the Gospels which has grown up at Cambridge and elsewhere during the present century, and numbers among its adherents some of the finest New Testament scholars of the age. The aim of the tradition has been to investigate the Gospels "without prepossessions"; its effect, to modify profoundly the age-long Christology of the Church, and to throw considerable doubt on the credibility of large parts of the Gospel story.

We read in the Preface that "on all questions of practical importance, the ultimate verdict is pronounced by the average man." This attractive work is certainly a great speech for the defence. Perhaps, before the jury decides, Dr. Foakes-Jackson (who contributes a characteristic Foreword) will give us the judicial summing-up.

This is not the place to estimate the intellectual soundness of "Critical Research," or its effect on the thought and life of the Church. But we would venture to criticize a few important specimens of the criticism, as set forth in the book. In the Birth-narratives, the author considers that St. Luke was probably mistaken about Quirinius; but he makes no mention of the *Lapis Tiburtinus*, which states that someone (name obliterated) was governor of Syria twice. As this inscription is conjectured by Ramsay and other defenders of St. Luke to refer to Quirinius, and regarded by them as an important witness, Mr. Gardner-Smith should not have disregarded it; but in this he probably follows the example set in Dr. Creed's edition of St. Luke's Gospel. The treatment of our Lord's Virgin Birth is not satisfactory; we are told that "the idea that the divinity of Christ is somehow bound up with the historicity of the Virgin Birth is perhaps common, but it is none the less childish"(!). "Critical Researchers" seem not to realize that many thinkers accept the Virgin Birth not in spite of, but because of, their intellectual powers; indeed, the tone of this passage is less critical than pontifical, though the author does admit that the notion of a virgin-birth is foreign to Jewish thought, and also that the Birth-chapters in the Gospels are among the most Jewish in the New Testament. He thinks the reference to the Birth in the Creed was made as a protection against Docetism, to safeguard belief in our Lord's *humanity*. In the last discourses in St. John, Mr. Gardner-Smith sees evidences of dislocation between chapters xiv. and xv. ("Arise, let us go hence. I am the true Vine"). This point was laboured at some length by Matthew Arnold in *God and the Bible*, and has been repeated by many writers since his time. But we respectfully ask whether anyone but a critic would see the smallest improbability in our Lord's continuing His discourse as He left the upper room by the steps outside the house, or taking His parable from a vine seen growing up the wall in the moonlight. Another "hardy annual" is the suggestion that

St. Mark xiii. 14 (" Let him that readeth understand ") is a parenthesis of the *writer*, implying that the whole passage is incorporated from some early Christian (written ?) apocalypse. But a Cambridge scholar should not ignore the deliberately expressed opinion of Dr. Hort (*Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*, p. 150), that " reading " is here a technical term for " reading the Old Testament," so that the parenthesis could quite well have been spoken by our Lord, meaning " Let him who readeth the phrase ' Abomination of Desolation,' in the prophecy of Daniel, understand."

On the whole, we feel that the author has not made out his case for " Critical Research " as against more conservative methods of interpretation. Such books as Hoskyns and Davey's *Riddle of the New Testament* and Burney's *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* might well have been included in the bibliography and considered in the text.

J. H. McCubbin.

The Development of the Supernatural in Human Experience. By Wallace Deane, M.A., B.D. James Clarke and Co. 6s.

The author has attempted to give an account of the transference of wonder and awe from less worthy to more worthy objects, and the consequent sublimation of these two " senses." It is a pity that the thesis of the book has prevented a fuller examination of the supernatural and its relation to the natural along the lines of the first chapter, which contains some excellent criticism of Barthian and allied theologies. This might have allowed the author to elaborate his conception of the status of values. As it is, he sometimes writes as if he thought of values as created by man—a position which one may gather from his book that he would not maintain. A considerable part of the book is devoted to an examination of the miracles of Jesus and the relation between " physical and spiritual laws." And, again, one might desire a closer examination of the meaning of the term " law " and its relation to rules. If Professor Stebbing's book *Philosophy and the Physicists* had been published earlier, Mr. Deane would have had to modify his two last chapters on " The New Marvellous " and " The Wonder of Personality." To try at the end of a book to prove the Personality of God is a hazardous undertaking. It is to be hoped that in his next book Mr. Deane will write either as a theologian or as an anthropologist, using the insight which he clearly possesses, but which is only sporadically shown in the present book.

Greta Hort.

The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel. By R. Eisler. Methuen. 12s. 6d.

To some people, no doubt, the controversialists who discuss the New Testament documents are all much alike, a large class (as others class together, say, " schoolchildren " or " athletes " or " middle-aged maiden ladies " or " men "): a large class, " theologians " or " doctors of divinity," " and that sort of thing." But indeed they are a strangely diverse people, these theologians, in spite of their community of occupation, and they seem to vary, among other things, with their environment. They seem unconsciously to borrow characteristics from contemporary fashions.

If anyone had said that a work on the Fourth Gospel could be very like a detective story, in the days of Bishop Westcott, he would have been reproved for flippancy.

But *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel*, by Robert Eisler, has some of the features of the literature which is so fashionable at present. It demands and taxes the sustained attention, it strains the sense of credibility, it delights in reversing the opinion which the reader may be supposed to have formed, it rises to a dramatic climax and comes to a conclusion where the author is felt to have found a complete satisfaction in which the reader is expected to share.

If the attraction of this book is something of this kind, if it has some of the characteristics of a detective story, it is clear that the reviewer will be spoiling the meeting of reader and writer by divulging the plot of the story. He will do better to hint darkly at the nature of the drama.

The author has adopted various positions with which several conjecturers have notably surprised their neighbours during the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. He has carried some of the conjectures farther than their authors and has woven them into a novel multiple conjecture of his own. He has gone over their arguments and illustrated them and illumined them with portraits and facsimiles and diagrams. He has written it all, rejoicing as a racer to run his race. He leaps. He slips through. He is found where no one could have foretold that he would be. And at the end of the course, there is he, breathless but triumphant, a very novel kind of lecturer on the Fourth Gospel.

One man will attach most importance to one thing he says, and another to another. I do not, for example, think many readers will feel that he has left where he found it the question of the death of the brother of James and son of Zebedee, or his relation to the Disciple whom Jesus loved, the writer of the Fourth Gospel. Elsewhere he has been less convincing, perhaps. But, here and there, surely, he will be felt to have done some road-making and bridge-building, rather than to have merely " blazed a trail " (so he calls it) through a jungle where we cannot seriously follow him. And the external evidence is as distracting, as difficult to reconcile with itself as the internal. So that the mind is still dissatisfied and restless.

J. M. C. Crum.

Stacy Waddy: Cricket, Travel and the Church. By Etheldred Waddy.

This is an arresting book; it should be given to those who say they don't believe in Missions, who think there is no spirit of adventure in the Church; it should be in the waiting-rooms of dentists and specialists, for the anxious and foreboding ones will soon lose themselves in these vivid pages, and catch their infectious gaiety.

For here is a record of a life, full to the brim of vitality, zest, fun, and of a joy of living which communicates itself to the reader in an unusual way. It is full of vivid story-telling, whether it be of cricket, of school-life, of the War, of the Holy Land, or of visits to distant mission-fields. It is shot through and through with the vigour and spirituality of a great personality.

Mrs. Waddy has shown notable skill in weaving together diaries, letters, sermons and verses, all of which show Stacy Waddy's diversity and talents, his width of outlook, his great capacity of work, and his deep spirituality.

He was an Australian, and the book begins with a brief account of his early day in New South Wales, his schooldays at Parramatta, his scholarship to Oxford, of his prowess at cricket. Then his call to the priesthood, and work at Oxford House and Bethnal Green; then back to Australia to work as Rector of Stockton, N.S.W., for five years.

Ten years as Headmaster of the King's School, Parramatta, the big public school of Australia: his career there being cut short by the Great War, for he felt impelled to serve as a Chaplain to the Forces. He served in France, Italy, Egypt, and in Palestine, and it was there that Bishop MacInnes learnt his worth, and when he was invalided out of the Army in 1916 he was offered a Canonry at St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem, and the task of reorganizing the educational work of the Anglican Church there.

Five years were spent at that post, and then the call to be Secretary to the S.P.G.; the last part of the book contains a graphic account of his missionary journeys, and work for that Society. Thirteen years packed full of strenuous travel, work at S.P.G. House, with its many contacts, and then, all too soon, his illness and death after an overfull visit to West Africa.

As would be expected, there are many illuminating passages dealing with the various problems of mission work, such as the future of the native races, and the complex situation in China and India; and through the whole of his life, runs in and out, like a bright stream of living water, his great love of the Psalms, culminating in his two books about them—*Homes of the Psalms* and *Gloria*—and his insistence on worship and thanksgiving, continuously shown in his preaching and teaching on the Eucharist.

H. W. Harrison.

Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. By H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat. Including contributions by Douglas Cockerell. With plates and figures. Pp. xii+112+43 plates+23 figures. British Museum. 1938. 32s. 6d.

The bibliographical description given above will suggest to students at any rate something of the wealth of information placed at their disposal by two of the Assistant Keepers in the Department of Manuscripts at the British Museum as the result of an examination of the *Codex Sinaiticus* made under conditions never before possible. The mere fact that they are able to claim that in regard, for example, to the last verse of St. John's Gospel (xxi. 25) " the evidence of the manuscript is now for the first time fully revealed," would in itself be enough to attract attention; but it is only one of many proofs afforded by their minutely detailed study that " the acquisition of a manuscript of which a complete photographic facsimile exists was by no means a useless expense . . . a close scrutiny has brought out very many points which no facsimile could ever yield." And from another aspect the chapter on " Condition, Repair, and Binding of the Manuscript " provides most valuable material for comparison in regard to technical features for which similar oppor-

tunities of observation have seldom been possible. Notes of the character and thickness of the vellum, the ink, the glue and other materials used in binding, like the description of modern methods of restoration, stretching, guarding, are likely to be interesting to most people, and not simply to those few who are capable of forming a judgement of the importance for dating of the "proof that the [Eusebian] apparatus was inserted by two of the scribes of the manuscript itself, and is therefore contemporary with the text," and the arguments from datable examples of "Biblical uncial," cursive notes and the method of representing numerals; or, again, of the evaluation of the colophon-designs which will probably seem, at any rate to some, to be both in itself and in the inferences that it suggests the most significant of the results which the authors have achieved. It might be argued that the conclusions would appear less cogent to those who did not feel satisfied as to the validity of the criterion; but the authors are fortunate in being able to provide and to illustrate in a very persuasive manner details of its application, not only in the case of Sinaiticus, but also of Vaticanus and Alexandrinus. "Non sunt multiplicandi scriptores præter necessitatem," and it is not very likely that the reduction of the number in the case of Sinaiticus from 4 to 3 will in future be seriously challenged. The investigation of the number of the "correctors" must, of course, proceed along different lines; but here, again, the discrimination of the "scriptorium corrections" does at least something to simplify the problem and the photographs illustrating the most characteristic features furnish a very large number of admirably selected examples. They will be found to repay detailed examination, even if the resulting impressions are neither so satisfying in all cases, nor so amusing as the evidence in the section on "Orthography and Dictation" which leads to the conclusion that *Codex Sinaiticus* "presents almost indubitable signs of having been written from dictation."

CLAUDE JENKINS.

EASTERN LITURGIES. By Sévérien Salaville. Sands and Co. 8s. 6d.

This book is an introduction to the study of Eastern liturgies adapted from the French by Mgr. J. Barton. It breathes a spirit of toleration and large-hearted sympathy with the Eastern Church. This is in accord with the policy of the present Pope as well as that of his predecessor, Leo XIII., who wrote, "The maintenance in being of the Eastern rites is of more importance than might be imagined. The august antiquity which lends dignity to these various rites is an adornment of the whole Church and a witness to the divine unity of the Catholic faith."

The purpose of this work is to encourage the study of Eastern rites in Latin Seminaries. Part I. deals with the liturgical families and the languages employed. As is well known, rites and languages are wholly distinct. Greek is the most important language, though Aramaic was the first liturgical language used by our Lord and the Apostles in Jerusalem. The treatment here is somewhat sketchy, and much of it reads like notes taken down in the lecture room. There can be no accurate study of liturgies without reference to the original texts, which are not given here. However, there is much useful information which can be supplemented by reference to larger works which are referred to in the notes.

Part II. is the most valuable section in which the author discusses the Church, its furnishings, the liturgical vestments and the ornaments of the Church now in use. There is nothing as full as this in English, and it will be valuable to any student who wishes to visualize the setting of eucharistic worship in the Eastern Church, though, after mastering this section, the reader may wish to return to the greater simplicity of the Western rite. There are some excellent photographs and a good bibliography.

F. N. Heazell.

Recollections and Appreciations. By A. S. Peake. Edited by W. F. Howard, D.D. Epworth Press. 6s.

From 1919 to his death in 1929 Professor Peake was editor of *The Holborn Review*, to which he contributed not only reviews but also frequent estimates and appreciations of leading biblical scholars and their work. These, together with memories of other outstanding personalities, have been gathered into the present volume, edited by Professor Howard. The book is published primarily for its autobiographical interest, and will be welcomed by all who knew Dr. Peake or have read his biography, for every article throws some light on his life or opinions. But it may well prove useful in addition to students of Biblical Theology, more especially those sections of it which describe and assess the work of German scholars.

Too often the Germans are for young students merely names quoted in a commentary, of whom they know nothing and whose authority they cannot estimate. Dr. Peake's articles do give us at least a nodding acquaintance with some of the leaders. The pity is that they are not twice as long.

As is only to be expected, this is an uneven book; sometimes too discursive, occasionally too brief and light to be of real value.

Its worst fault is that it is doubly tantalizing. It shews us glimpses of the author's personality and makes us want to see more.

It gives us brief estimates of other scholars, and again we would like something more. However, as the preface points out, there are other books by Dr. Peake as well as his biography to satisfy our curiosity.

J. A. Fisher.

Christian Moral Conduct. By A. E. Garvie, D.D. Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Garvie has managed to compress into 150 pages an almost complete survey of Christian moral conduct. It is an exceedingly well planned and logical book. The author is not content with a mere discussion of how a Christian should conduct himself in all the moral problems of the day, but goes to the root of the matter.

He first points out the relation between religion and morality, then defends the possibility of conscious voluntary action by human beings, defines moral conduct, distinguishes the essentials of Christian moral conduct, and with the aid of psychology analyses human nature, character, and personality. The last half of the book is devoted to a sound and

sober presentation of Christian conduct under the headings: Love of Self, Love of Home, and Love of Neighbour.

Unfortunately the very thoroughness with which Dr. Garvie has fulfilled his task may render it partly ineffective. It is doubtful whether any but an earnest enquirer with considerable capacity for taking pains will read and digest the first half of the book.

It reminds one of a provincial shop window crammed with goods from top to bottom. The goods may be valuable—Dr. Garvie's certainly are—but there is nothing which stands out to attract the casual passer-by. This in one of a series written for the passer-by is regrettable. On the other hand, the book will supply a real need, for it will make an excellent textbook for study circles and tutorial classes.

J. A. FISHER.

THE COURAGE TO BE REAL. By Geoffrey Allen. Alexander Maclehose. 5s.

This is a sensible book which has the great merit of being easy to read. It is a series of nine essays dealing with the nature of conversion and of growth in the Christian life. The author starts, as we should expect, with the need for an inner process of rebirth through frank recognition of our real character, leading to the acceptance of forgiveness. Throughout the book he shews considerable psychological insight and the capacity for producing sentences which stick in the mind.

In his second essay, "The Kingdom," he reinterprets our Lord's Kingdom parables on the theory that every parable describes some side of this process of conversion. One cannot help feeling here that the author is still too close to his own conversion to have achieved a true perspective; but at least his interpretation is stimulating. The essays which form the centre of the book are wise and penetrating in their analysis of the inner needs and difficulties of the individual. Particularly fine is his insistence in the essay on "Growth" that Christianity is a religion of maturity.

The last essays in which he turns away from the purely individual problems of the inner life to discuss Evangelism and Missions are introduced by the most original and provocative essay of all. In it Mr. Allen analyses the nature of crowds and their characteristic behaviour, finally comparing the community feeling of this century with the fellowship of the New Testament.

J. A. FISHER.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher